arXiv:1607.03052v1 [math.GR] 11 Jul 2016

LINEAR PROGRAMMING AND THE INTERSECTION OF FREE SUBGROUPS IN FREE PRODUCTS OF GROUPS

S. V. IVANOV

Abstract. We study the intersection of finitely generated factor-free subgroups of free products of groups by utilizing the method of linear programming. For example, we prove that if H_1 is a finitely generated factor-free noncyclic subgroup of the free product $G_1 * G_2$ of two finite groups G_1, G_2, then the Walter Neumann coefficient $\sigma(H_1)$ of H_1 is rational and can be computed. This coefficient $\sigma(H_1)$ is the minimal positive real number such that, for every finitely generated factor-free subgroup H_2 of $G_1 * G_2$, it is true that $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2) \leq \sigma(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)$, where $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H) = \max(\mathrm{r}(H) - 1, 0)$ is reduced rank of H, $\mathrm{r}(H)$ is rank of H, and $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2)$ is reduced rank of a generalized intersection of H_1, H_2.

1. Introduction

Let G_α, $\alpha \in I$, be some nontrivial groups and let $\mathcal{F} = \prod^*_{\alpha\in I} G_\alpha$ denote the free product of these groups. According to the classic Kurosh subgroup theorem [20], [21], every subgroup H of $\mathcal{F}$ is a free product $F(H) * \prod^* t_{\alpha,\gamma} H_{\alpha,\gamma} t^{-1}_{\alpha,\gamma}$, where $H_{\alpha,\gamma}$ is a subgroup of G_α, $t_{\alpha,\gamma} \in \mathcal{F}$, and $F(H)$ is a free subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$ such that, for every $s \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\gamma \in I$, it is true that $F(H) \cap sG_\gamma s^{-1} = \{1\}$. We say that H is a *factor-free* subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$ if $H = F(H)$ in the above form of H, i.e., for every $s \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\gamma \in I$, we have $H \cap sG_\gamma s^{-1} = \{1\}$. Let $\mathrm{r}(F)$ denote the rank of a (finitely generated) free group F. Since a factor-free subgroup H of $\mathcal{F}$ is free, the reduced rank $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H) := \max(\mathrm{r}(H) - 1, 0)$ of H, where $\mathrm{r}(H)$ is the rank of H, is well defined.

Let $q^* = q^*(G_\alpha, \alpha \in I)$ denote the minimum of orders > 2 of finite subgroups of groups G_α, $\alpha \in I$, and let $q^* := \infty$ if there are no such subgroups. It is clear that either q^* is an odd prime or $q^* \in \{4, \infty\}$. If $q^* = \infty$, define $\frac{q^*}{q^*-2} := 1$. Dicks and the author [6] proved that if H_1, H_2 are finitely generated factor-free subgroups of $\mathcal{F}$, then

$$\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2) \leq 2\tfrac{q^*}{q^*-2}\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2). \tag{1.1}$$

Dicks and the author [6] conjectured that if groups G_α, $\alpha \in I$, contain no involutions, then the coefficient 2 could be left out and

$$\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2) \leq \tfrac{q^*}{q^*-2}\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2). \tag{1.2}$$

This conjecture can be regarded as a far reaching generalization of the Hanna Neumann conjecture [23] on rank of the intersection of subgroups in free groups. Recall that the Hanna Neumann conjecture [23] claims that if H_1, H_2 are finitely generated subgroups of a free group, then $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2) \leq \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)$. For more

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 20E06, 20E07, 20F65, 90C90.

Key words and phrases. Free products of groups, free and factor-free subgroups, rank of intersection of factor-free subgroups, linear programming.

Supported in part by the NSF under grant DMS 09-01782.

discussion, partial results and proofs of this conjecture the reader is referred to [4], [5], [8], [18], [22], [24], [26], [27].

The conjecture (1.2) is established by Dicks and the author [7] in the case when $\mathcal{F}$ is the free product of two groups of order 3 in which case $q^* = 3$ and (1.2) turns into

$$\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2) \le \tfrac{q^*}{q^*-2}\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2) = 3\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2).$$

Another special case in which the conjecture (1.2) is known to be true is the case when $\mathcal{F}$ is the free product of infinite cyclic groups, i.e., $\mathcal{F}$ is a free group, as follows from Friedman's [8] and Mineyev's [22] proofs of the Hanna Neumann conjecture, see also Dicks's proof [5]. In this case $q^* = \infty$ and the inequality (1.2) turns into

$$\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2) \le \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2). \tag{1.3}$$

More generally, the inequality (1.3) also holds in the case when $\mathcal{F}$ is the free product of right orderable groups as follows from results of Antolín, Martino, and Schwabrow [1], see also [18]. We mention that it follows from results of [6] that the conjectured inequality (1.2) is sharp and may not be improved.

In an attempt to improve on the bound (1.1) in a special case, Dicks and the author [7] showed that

$$\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2) \le \left(2 - \tfrac{(4+2\sqrt{3})p}{(2p-3+\sqrt{3})^2}\right) \cdot \tfrac{p}{p-2}\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2) \tag{1.4}$$

for finitely generated factor-free subgroups H_1, H_2 of the free product $C_p * C_p$ of two cyclic groups of prime order $p > 2$.

Note that for $p = 3$ the inequality (1.4) yields the conjectured inequality (1.2). However, for prime $p \ge 5$, the problem whether the inequality (1.2) holds for the free product of two cyclic groups of order p remains open and seems to be the most basic and appealing case of the conjecture (1.2) for groups with torsion. In this connection, we remark that the ideas of articles [1], [5], [8], [22], do not look to be applicable to the case of free products with torsion and shed no light on the conjecture (1.2) for free products of groups with torsion, especially, for free products of finite groups.

In this article, however, we will not attempt to prove or improve on any upper bounds. Instead, we will look at generalized intersections of finitely generated factor-free subgroups in free products of groups from a disparate standpoint and prove results of quite different flavor by utilizing the method of linear programming.

First we recall a stronger version of the conjecture (1.2) that generalizes the strengthened Hanna Neumann conjecture which was put forward by Walter Neumann [24] for subgroups of free groups. Let H_1, H_2 be finitely generated factor-free subgroups of an arbitrary free product $\mathcal{F} = \prod^*_{\alpha\in I} G_\alpha$ of groups G_α, $\alpha \in I$, let the number $\frac{q^*}{q^*-2}$ be defined for $\mathcal{F}$ as above, and let $S(H_1, H_2)$ denote a set of representatives of those double cosets H_1tH_2 of $\mathcal{F}$, $t \in \mathcal{F}$, that have the property $H_1 \cap tH_2t^{-1} \ne \{1\}$. Then the strengthened version of the conjecture (1.2) claims that

$$\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2) := \sum_{s\in S(H_1,H_2)} \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap sH_2s^{-1}) \le \tfrac{q^*}{q^*-2}\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2), \tag{1.5}$$

where $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2)$ is reduced rank of the generalized intersection of H_1 and H_2 consisting of subgroups $H_1 \cap sH_2s^{-1}$, $s \in S(H_1, H_2)$.

Let $\mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{ff}}(\mathcal{F})$ denote the set of all finitely generated noncyclic factor-free subgroups of the free product $\mathcal{F}$. Pick a subgroup $H_1 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{ff}}(\mathcal{F})$. We will say that a real number $\sigma(H_1) > 0$ is the *Walter Neumann coefficient* for H_1, or, briefly, the WN-coefficient for H_1, if, for every $H_2 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{ff}}(\mathcal{F})$, we have

$$\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2) \le \sigma(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2) \tag{1.6}$$

and $\sigma(H_1)$ is minimal with this property. Clearly,

$$\sigma(H_1) = \sup\{\tfrac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1,H_2)}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)}\}$$

over all subgroups $H_2 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{ff}}(\mathcal{F})$.

For every integer $d \ge 3$, we also define the number

$$\sigma_d(H_1) := \sup\{\tfrac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1,H_2)}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)}\} \tag{1.7}$$

over all subgroups $H_2 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{ff}}(\mathcal{F}, d)$, where $\mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{ff}}(\mathcal{F}, d)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{ff}}(\mathcal{F})$ consisting of those subgroups whose irreducible core graphs have all of its vertices of degree at most d, see Sect. 2 for definitions. This number $\sigma_d(H_1)$ is called the WN_d-*coefficient* for H_1. Since $\mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{ff}}(\mathcal{F}, d) \subseteq \mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{ff}}(\mathcal{F}, d+1)$, it follows from the definitions that $\sigma_d(H_1) \le \sigma_{d+1}(H_1) \le \sigma(H_1)$ and $\lim_{d\to\infty} \sigma_d(H_1) = \sigma(H_1)$.

For example, it folows from results of [6, 7] mentioned above that if $\mathcal{F} = C_p * C_p$ is the free product of two cyclic groups of prime order $p > 2$ and $H_1 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathsf{ff}}(\mathcal{F})$, then

$$\tfrac{p}{p-2} \le \sigma_d(H_1) \le \sigma(H_1) \le \left(2 - \tfrac{(4+2\sqrt{3})p}{(2p-3+\sqrt{3})^2}\right) \cdot \tfrac{p}{p-2}.$$

The main technical result of this article is the following.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F} = G_1 * G_2$ is the free product of two nontrivial groups G_1, G_2 and H_1 is a finitely generated factor-free noncyclic subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$. Then the following claims are true.*

(a) *For every integer $d \ge 3$, there exists a linear programming problem (LP-problem)*

$$\mathcal{P}(H_1, d) = \max\{c(d)x(d) \mid A(d)x(d) \le b(d)\} \tag{1.8}$$

with integer coefficients whose solution is equal to $-\sigma_d(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$.

(b) *There is a finitely generated factor-free subgroup H_2^* of $\mathcal{F}$, $H_2^* = H_2^*(H_1)$, which corresponds to a vertex solution of the dual problem*

$$\mathcal{P}^*(H_1, d) = \min\{b(d)^\top y(d) \mid A(d)^\top y(d) = c(d)^\top,\ y(d) \ge 0\}$$

of the primal LP-problem (1.8) *of part (a) such that $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2^*) = \sigma_d(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2^*)$. In particular, the WN_d-coefficient $\sigma_d(H_1)$ of H_1 is rational. Furthermore, if $\Psi(H_1)$, $\Psi(H_2^*)$ denote irreducible core graphs representing subgroups H_1, H_2^*, resp., and $|E\Psi|$ is the number of oriented edges in a graph Ψ, then*

$$|E\Psi(H_2^*)| < 2^{2^{4|E\Psi(H_1)|+1+\log_2\log_2(2d)}}.$$

(c) *There exists a linear semi-infinite programming problem (LSIP-problem) $\mathcal{P}(H_1) = \sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ with finitely many variables in x and with countably many constraints in the system $Ax \le b$ whose dual problem*

$$\mathcal{P}^*(H_1) = \inf\{b^\top y \mid A^\top y = c^\top,\ y \ge 0\}$$

has a solution equal to $-\sigma(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$.

(d) *Let the word problem for both groups G_1, G_2 be solvable and let an irreducible core graph $\Psi(H_1)$ of H_1 be given. Then the LP-problem* (1.8) *of part (a) can be effectively written down and the WN_d-coefficient $\sigma_d(H_1)$ for H_1 can be computed.*

In addition, an irreducible core graph $\Psi(H_2^*)$ of the subgroup H_2^* of part (b) can be effectively constructed.

(e) *Let both G_1, G_2 be finite, let $d := \max(|G_1|, |G_2|) \geq 3$, and let an irreducible core graph $\Psi(H_1)$ of H_1 be given. Then the LP-problem* (1.8) *of part (a) coincides with the LSIP-problem $\mathcal{P}(H_1)$ of part (c) and the WN-coefficient $\sigma(H_1)$ for H_1 is rational and computable.*

It is worthwhile to mention that the correspondence $H_2 \to y(H_2)$ between subgroups $H_2 \in \mathcal{K}_{\mathrm{ff}}(\mathcal{F}, d)$, with a special property (Bd), see Sect. 3, and vectors $y(H_2)$ of the feasible polyhedron $\{y(d) \mid A(d)^\top y(d) = c(d)^\top,\ y(d) \geq 0\}$ of the dual problem $\mathcal{P}^*(H_1, d)$, that is mentioned in part (b) of Theorem 1.1, plays an important role in proofs and is reminiscent of the correspondence between (almost) normal surfaces in 3-dimensional manifolds and their (resp. almost) normal vectors in the Haken theory of normal surfaces and its generalizations, see [10, 11, 12, 16, 19]. In particular, the idea of a vertex solution works equally well both in the context of almost normal surfaces [16], see also [11, 19], and in the context of factor-free subgroups, providing in either situation both the connectedness of the underlying object represented by a vertex solution and an upper bound on size of the underlying object.

Relying on the linear programming approach of Theorem 1.1, in the following Theorem 1.2, we look at the computational complexity of the problem to calculate the WN-coefficient $\sigma(H_1)$ for a factor-free subgroup H_1 of the free product of two finite groups.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F} = G_1 * G_2$ is the free product of two nontrivial finite groups G_1, G_2 and H_1 is a subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$ given by a finite generating set $\mathcal{S}$ of words over the alphabet $\mathcal{A} = G_1 \cup G_2$. Then the following are true.*

(a) *In deterministic polynomial time of size of $\mathcal{S}$, one can determine whether H_1 is factor-free and noncyclic and, if so, one can construct an irreducible graph $\Psi_o(H_1)$ of H_1.*

(b) *If H_1 is factor-free and noncylcic, then, in deterministic exponential time of size of $\mathcal{S}$, one can write down and solve an LP-problem $\mathcal{P} = \max\{cx \mid Ax \leq b\}$ whose solution is equal to $-\sigma(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$. In particular, the WN-coefficient $\sigma(H_1)$ of H_1 is computable in deterministic exponential time of size of $\mathcal{S}$.*

(c) *If H_1 is factor-free and noncylcic, then, in deterministic double exponential time of size of $\mathcal{S}$, one can construct an irreducible core graph $\Psi(H_2^*)$ of H_2^*, where H_2^* is a finitely generated factor-free subgroup $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2^*) = \sigma(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2^*)$. In addition, if $|E\Psi|$ denotes the number of oriented edges of a graph Ψ, $\Psi(H_1)$ is an irreducible core graph of H_1, and $d := \max(|G_1|, |G_2|)$, then $|E\Psi(H_2^*)| < 2^{2^{4|E\Psi(H_1)|+1+\log_2 \log_2(2d)}}$.*

The situation with free products of more than two factors is more difficult to study and we will make additional efforts to obtain the following.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F} = \prod_{\alpha \in I}^* G_\alpha$ is the free product of nontrivial groups G_α, $\alpha \in I$, and H_1 is a finitely generated factor-free noncyclic subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$. Then there are two disjoint finite subsets I_1, I_2 of I such that if $\widehat{G}_1 := \prod_{\alpha \in I_1}^* G_\alpha$, $\widehat{G}_2 := \prod_{\alpha \in I_2}^* G_\alpha$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{F}} := \widehat{G}_1 * \widehat{G}_2$, then there exists a finitely generated factor-free subgroup $\widehat{H}_1$ of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ with the following properties.*

(a) $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\widehat{H}_1) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$, $\sigma_d(\widehat{H}_1) \geq \sigma_d(H_1)$ *for every* $d \geq 3$, *and* $\sigma(\widehat{H}_1) \geq \sigma(H_1)$. *In particular, if the conjecture* (1.5) *fails for* H_1 *then the conjecture* (1.5) *also fails for* $\widehat{H}_1$.

(b) *If the word problem for all groups* G_α, $\alpha \in I_1 \cup I_2$, *is solvable and a finite irreducible graph of* H_1 *is given, then the LP-problem* $\mathcal{P}(\widehat{H}_1, d)$ *for* $\widehat{H}_1$ *of part (a) of Theorems 1.1 can be effectively written down and the* WN_d*-coefficient* $\sigma_d(\widehat{H}_1)$ *for* $\widehat{H}_1$ *can be computed.*

(c) *Let groups* G_α, *where* $\alpha \in I_1 \cup I_2$, *be finite, let* H_1 *be effectively given either by a finite irreducible graph or by a finite generating set, and let*

$$d' := \max\{|I_1 \cup I_2|, \max\{|G_\alpha| : \alpha \in I_1 \cup I_2\}\}.$$

Then $\sigma_{d'}(\widehat{H}_1) \geq \sigma(H_1)$ *and there is an algorithm that decides whether the conjecture* (1.5) *holds for* H_1.

We remark that proofs of Theorems 1.2–1.3 provide a practical deterministic algorithm (with exponential running time, though) to compute the WN-coefficient $\sigma(H_1)$ for a finitely generated factor-free subgroup H_1 of the free product of two finite groups and to determine whether a certain finitely generated factor-free subgroup of a free product of finite groups satisfies the conjecture (1.5). It seems to be of interest to implement this algorithm and experiment with it.

The article is structured as follows. In Sect. 2, we define basic notions and recall geometric ideas that are used to study finitely generated factor-free subgroups and their intersections in a free product $\mathcal{F}$. In particular, we define a finite labeled graph $\Psi(H)$ associated with such a subgroup H of $\mathcal{F}$. In Sect. 3, we consider the free product $\mathcal{F} = G_1 * G_2$ of two nontrivial groups G_1, G_2 and introduce certain linear inequalities associated with the groups G_1, G_2 and with a graph $\Psi(H_1)$ of H_1, where H_1 is a finitely generated factor-free noncyclic subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$. Informally, these inequalities are used for construction of cores of potential fiber product graphs $\Psi(H_1) \times \Psi(H_2)$, where H_2 is another finitely generated factor-free subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$, and subsequent translation to linear programming. More formally, these inequalities enable us to define an LP-problem $\max\{c(d)x(d) \mid A(d)x(d) \leq b(d)\}$, corresponding to $\Psi(H_1)$ and to an integer $d \geq 3$, and to define an LSIP-problem $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \leq b\}$, corresponding to $\Psi(H_1)$. We also consider and make use of the dual problems of the primal problems $\max\{c(d)x(d) \mid A(d)x(d) \leq b(d)\}$, $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \leq b\}$. Basic results and terminology of linear programming are recalled in Sect. 4. These LP-, LSIP-problems and their dual problems are investigated in Sects. 3–4. In Sect. 5, we look at the case of free products of more than two groups and prove a few more technical lemmas. Proofs of Theorems 1.1–1.3 are given in Sect. 6.

2. Preliminaries

Let G_α, $\alpha \in I$, be nontrivial groups, let $\mathcal{F} = \prod^*_{\alpha \in I} G_\alpha$ be their free product, and let H be a finitely generated factor-free subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$, $H \neq \{1\}$. Consider the alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \cup_{\alpha \in I} G_\alpha$, where $G_\alpha \cap G_{\alpha'} = \{1\}$ if $\alpha \neq \alpha'$.

Analogously to the graph-theoretic approach of articles [6, 7, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18], we first define a labeled $\mathcal{A}$-graph $\Psi(H)$ which geometrically represents H in a manner similar to the way Stallings graphs represent subgroups of a free group, see [26].

If Γ is a graph, $V\Gamma$ denotes the vertex set of Γ and $E\Gamma$ denotes the set of oriented edges of Γ. For $e \in E\Gamma$ let e_-, e_+ denote the initial, terminal, resp., vertices of

e and let e^{-1} be the edge with the opposite (to e) orientation, where $e^{-1} \neq e$ for every $e \in E\Gamma$, $(e^{-1})_- = e_+$, $(e^{-1})_+ = e_-$. A *path* $p = e_1 \dots e_k$ in Γ is a sequence of edges $e_1, \dots, e_k$ such that $(e_i)_+ = (e_{i+1})_-$, $i = 1, \dots, k-1$. Define $p_- := (e_1)_-$, $p_+ := (e_k)_+$, and $|p| := k$, where $|p|$ is the *length* of p. We allow the possibility that $p = \{p_-\} = \{p_+\}$ and $|p| = 0$. A path p is *closed* if $p_- = p_+$. A path p is called *reduced* if p contains no subpaths of the form ee^{-1}, $e \in E\Gamma$. A closed path $p = e_1 \dots e_k$ is *cyclically reduced* if $|p| > 0$ and both p and the cyclic permutation $e_2 \dots e_k e_1$ of p are reduced paths. The *core* of a graph Γ, denoted core(Γ), is the minimal subgraph of Γ that contains every edge e which can be included into a cyclically reduced path in Γ.

Let Ψ be a graph whose vertex set $V\Psi$ consists of two disjoint nonempty parts $V_P\Psi, V_S\Psi$, so $V\Psi = V_P\Psi \cup V_S\Psi$. Vertices in $V_P\Psi$ are called *primary* and vertices in $V_S\Psi$ are called *secondary*. Every edge $e \in E\Psi$ connects primary and secondary vertices, hence Ψ is a bipartite graph. Ψ is called a *labeled $\mathcal{A}$-graph*, or briefly *$\mathcal{A}$-graph*, if Ψ is equipped with functions

$$\varphi : E\Psi \to \mathcal{A}, \qquad \theta : V_S\Psi \to I,$$

called *labeling*, such that, for every edge $e \in E\Psi$, it is true that $\varphi(e) \in \mathcal{A} = \cup_{\alpha\in I} G_\alpha$, $\varphi(e^{-1}) = \varphi(e)^{-1}$, and, if $e_+ \in V_S\Psi$, then $\varphi(e) \in G_\alpha$ for $\alpha = \theta(e_+)$. If $e_+ \in V_S\Psi$, define $\theta(e) := \theta(e_+)$, $\theta(e^{-1}) := \theta(e_+)$ and call $\theta(e_+)$, $\theta(e)$ the *type* of a vertex $e_+ \in V_S\Psi$ and of an edge $e \in E\Psi$. Thus, for every $e \in E\Psi$, we have defined an element $\varphi(e) \in \mathcal{A}$, called the label of e, and an element $\theta(e) \in I$, termed the type of e.

The reader familiar with van Kampen diagrams over a free product of groups, as defined in [21], will recognize that our labeling function $\varphi : E\Psi \to \mathcal{A}$ is defined in the way analogous to labeling functions on van Kampen diagrams over free products of groups. Recall that van Kampen diagrams are planar 2-complexes whereas graphs are 1-complexes, however, apart from this, the ideas of cancelations and edge folding work equally well for both diagrams and graphs.

An $\mathcal{A}$-graph Ψ is called *irreducible* if properties (P1)–(P3) hold true:

(P1) If $e, f \in E\Psi$, $e_- = f_- \in V_P\Psi$, and $e_+ \neq f_+$, then $\theta(e) \neq \theta(f)$.
(P2) If $e, f \in E\Psi$, $e \neq f$, and $e_+ = f_+ \in V_S\Psi$, then $\varphi(e) \neq \varphi(f)$ in $G_{\theta(e)}$.
(P3) Ψ has no multiple edges, $\deg_\Psi v > 0$ for every $v \in V\Psi$, and there is at most one vertex of degree 1 in Ψ which, if exists, is primary.

Suppose Ψ is a connected finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph and a primary vertex $o \in V_P\Psi$ is distinguished so that $\deg_\Psi o = 1$ if Ψ happens to have a vertex of degree 1. Then o is called the *base* vertex of $\Psi = \Psi_o$.

As usual, elements of the free product $\mathcal{F} = \prod^*_{\alpha\in I} G_\alpha$ are regarded as words over the alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \cup_{\alpha\in I} G_\alpha$, where $G_\alpha \cap G_{\alpha'} = \{1\}$ if $\alpha \neq \alpha'$. A *syllable* of a word W over $\mathcal{A}$ is a maximal nonempty subword of W all of whose letters belong to the same factor G_α. The *syllable length* $\|W\|$ of W is the number of syllables of W, while the *length* $|W|$ of W is the number of all letters in W. For example, if $a_1, a_2 \in G_\alpha$, then $|a_1 1 a_2| = 3$, $\|a_1 1 a_2\| = 1$, and $|1| = \|1\| = 1$.

A nonempty word W over $\mathcal{A}$ is called *reduced* if every syllable of W consists of a single letter. Clearly, $|W| = \|W\|$ if W is reduced. Note that an arbitrary nontrivial element of the free product $\mathcal{F}$ can be uniquely written as a reduced word. A word W is called *cyclically reduced* if W^2 is reduced. We write $U \overset{0}{=} W$ if words U, W

are equal as elements of $\mathcal{F}$. The literal (or letter-by-letter) equality of words U, W is denoted $U \equiv W$.

If $p = e_1 \dots e_k$ is a path in an $\mathcal{A}$-graph Ψ and $e_1, \dots, e_k$ are edges of Ψ, then the *label* $\varphi(p)$ of p is the word $\varphi(p) := \varphi(e_1) \dots \varphi(e_k)$.

The significance of irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graphs for geometric interpretation of factor-free subgroups H of $\mathcal{F}$ is given in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Suppose H is a finitely generated factor-free subgroup of the free product $\mathcal{F} = \prod_{\alpha\in I}^{*} G_\alpha$, $H \neq \{1\}$. Then there exists a finite connected irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph $\Psi = \Psi_o(H)$, with a base vertex o, such that a reduced word W over the alphabet $\mathcal{A}$ belongs to H if and only if there is a reduced path p in $\Psi_o(H)$ such that $p_- = p_+ = o$, $\varphi(p) \overset{0}{=} W$ in $\mathcal{F}$, and $|p| = 2|W|$.*

In addition, assume that all factors G_α, $\alpha \in I$, are finite and $V_1, \dots, V_k$ are words over $\mathcal{A}$. Then there is an algorithm which, in time polynomial of $|V_1| + \dots + |V_k|$, decides whether the subgroup $H_V = \langle V_1, \dots, V_k \rangle$, generated by $V_1, \dots, V_k$, is factor-free and, if so, constructs an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph $\Psi_o(H_V)$ for H_V.

Proof. The proof is based on Stallings's folding techniques and is somewhat analogous to the proof of van Kampen lemma for diagrams over free products of groups, see [21] (in fact, it is simpler because foldings need not preserve the property of being planar for diagrams).

Let $H_V = \langle V_1, \dots, V_k \rangle$ be a subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$, generated by some words $V_1, \dots, V_k$ over $\mathcal{A}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $V_1, \dots, V_k$ are reduced words. Consider a graph $\widetilde{\Psi}$ which consists of k closed paths $p_1, \dots, p_k$ such that they have a single common vertex $o = (p_i)_-$, and $|p_i| = 2|V_i|$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. We distinguish o as the base vertex of $\widetilde{\Psi}$ and call o primary, the vertices adjacent to o are called secondary vertices and so on. Denote $V \equiv a_{i,1} \dots a_{i,\ell_i}$, where $a_{i,j} \in \mathcal{A}$ are letters, $i = 1, \dots, k$, and let $p_i = e_{i,1} f_{i,1} \dots e_{i,\ell_i} f_{i,\ell_i}$, where $e_{i,j}, f_{i,j}$ are edges of the path p_i. The labeling functions φ, θ on the path p_i are defined so that if $a_{i,j} \in G_{\alpha(i,j)}$, then

$$\theta(e_{i,j}) := \alpha(i,j), \quad \theta(f_{i,j}) := \alpha(i,j), \quad \varphi(e_{i,j}) := a_{i,j} b_{i,j}^{-1}, \ \varphi(f_{i,j}) := b_{i,j},$$

where $b_{i,j}$ is an element of the group $G_{\alpha(i,j)}$.

Clearly, $\varphi(p_i) \overset{0}{=} V_i$ in $\mathcal{F}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

It is also clear that $\widetilde{\Psi} = \widetilde{\Psi}_o$ is a finite connected $\mathcal{A}$-graph with the base vertex o that has the following property.

(Q) A word $W \in \mathcal{F}$ belongs to H if and only if there is a path p in $\widetilde{\Psi}_o$ such that $p_- = p_+ = o$ and $\varphi(p) \overset{0}{=} W$.

However, $\widetilde{\Psi}_o$ need not be irreducible and we will do foldings of edges in $\widetilde{\Psi}_o$ which preserve property (Q) and which are aimed to achieve properties (P1)–(P2).

Assume that property (P1) fails for edges e, f with $e_- = f_- \in V_P\widetilde{\Psi}_o$ so that $e_+ \neq f_+$ and $\theta(e) = \theta(f)$. Let us redefine the labels of all edges e' with $e'_+ = e_+$ so that $\varphi(e')\varphi(e)^{-1}$ does not change and $\varphi(e) = \varphi(f)$ in $G_{\theta(e)}$. This can be done by multiplication of φ-labels on the right by $\varphi(e)^{-1}\varphi(f)$. Since $\varphi(e) = \varphi(f)$ and $\theta(e) = \theta(f)$, we may now identify the edges e, f and vertices e_+, f_+. Observe that this folding preserves property (Q) ((P2) might fail) and decreases the total edge number $|E\widetilde{\Psi}_o|$. This operation changes the labels of edges and can be done in time polynomial in $|V_1| + \dots + |V_k|$ if all factors G_α, $\alpha \in I$, are finite. Note that if

G_α were not finite, then there would be a problem with increasing space needed to store φ-labels of edges and subsequent computations with larger labels.

If property (P2) fails for edges e, f and $\varphi(e) = \varphi(f)$ in $G_{\theta(e)}$, then we identify the edges e, f. Note property (Q) still holds ((P1) might fail) and the number $|E\widetilde{\Psi}_o|$ decreases.

Suppose property (P3) fails and there are two distinct edges e, f in $\widetilde{\Psi}_o$ such that $e_- = f_-$ and $e_+ = f_+ \in V_S\widetilde{\Psi}_o$. If $\varphi(e) \neq \varphi(f)$ in $G_{\theta(e)}$, then a conjugate of $\varphi(e)\varphi(f)^{-1} \in G_{\theta(e)}$ is in H_V, hence we conclude that H_V is not factor-free. So we may assume that $\varphi(e) = \varphi(f)$ in $G_{\theta(e)}$. Then we identify the edges e, f, thus preserving property (Q) and decreasing the number $|E\widetilde{\Psi}_o|$. If property (P3) fails so that there is a vertex v of degree 1, different from o, then we delete v along with the incident edge. Clearly, property (Q) still holds and the number $|E\widetilde{\Psi}_o|$ decreases.

Thus, by induction on $|E\widetilde{\Psi}_o|$ in polynomially many (relative to $\sum_{i=1}^k |V_i|$) steps as described above, we either establish that the subgroup H_V is not factor-free or construct an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph Ψ_o with property (Q).

It follows from the definitions and from property (Q) of the graph Ψ_o that H_V is factor-free (see also Lemma 2.2). Other stated properties of Ψ_o are straightforward.

Finally, we observe that if all factors G_α, $\alpha \in I$, are finite, then the space required to store the φ-label of an edge of intermediate graphs is constant and multiplication (or inversion) of φ-labels would require time bounded by a constant. Therefore, the above procedure implies the existence of a polynomial algorithm for finding out whether a subgroup $H_V = \langle V_1, \dots, V_k\rangle$ of $\mathcal{F}$ is factor-free and for construction of a finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph Ψ_o for H_V. □

The following lemma further elaborates on the correspondence between finitely generated factor-free subgroups of the free product $\mathcal{F}$ and finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graphs.

Lemma 2.2. *Let Ψ_o be a finite connected irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph with the base vertex o and let $H = H(\Psi_o)$ be a subgroup of the free product $\mathcal{F}$ that consists of all words $\varphi(p)$, where p is a path in Ψ_o such that $p_- = p_+ = o$. Then H is a factor-free subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H) = -\chi(\Psi_o)$, where $\chi(\Psi_o) = |V\Psi_o| - \frac{1}{2}|E\Psi_o|$ is the Euler characteristic of Ψ_o.*

Proof. This follows from the facts that the fundamental group $\pi_1(\Psi_o, o)$ of Ψ_o at o is free of rank $-\chi(\Psi_o) + 1$ and that the homomorphism $\pi_1(\Psi_o, o) \to \mathcal{F}$, given by $p \to \varphi(p)$, where p is a path with $p_- = p_+ = o$, has the trivial kernel in view of properties (P1)–(P2). □

Suppose H is a nontrivial finitely generated factor-free subgroup of a free product $\mathcal{F} = \prod^*_{\alpha\in I} G_\alpha$, and $\Psi_o = \Psi_o(H)$ is a finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph for H as in Lemma 2.1. We say that $\Psi_o(H)$ is an *irreducible graph* of H.

Let $\Psi(H) := \mathrm{core}(\Psi_o(H))$ denote the core of an irreducible graph $\Psi_o(H)$ of H. Clearly, $\Psi(H)$ has no vertices of degree ≤ 1 and $\Psi(H)$ is also an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph. We say that $\Psi(H)$ is an *irreducible core graph* of H.

It is easy to see that an irreducible graph $\Psi_o(H)$ of H can be obtained back from an irreducible core graph $\Psi(H)$ of H by attaching a suitable path p to $\Psi(H)$ so that p starts at a primary vertex o, ends in $p_+ \in V_P\Psi(H)$, and then by doing foldings of edges as in the proof of Lemma 2.1, see Fig. 2.1.



Fig. 2.1

Now suppose H_1, H_2 are nontrivial finitely generated factor-free subgroups of $\mathcal{F}$. Consider a set $S(H_1, H_2)$ of representatives of those double cosets $H_1 t H_2$ of $\mathcal{F}$, $t \in \mathcal{F}$, that have the property $H_1 \cap tH_2t^{-1} \neq \{1\}$. For every $s \in S(H_1, H_2)$, define the subgroup $K_s := H_1 \cap sH_2s^{-1}$. Similarly to articles [13, 14, 15, 17, 18] and analogously to the case of free groups, see [4, 24], we now construct a finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph $\Psi(H_1, H_2)$, also denoted $\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Psi(H_2))$, whose connected components are irreducible core graphs $\Psi(K_s)$, $s \in S(H_1, H_2)$.

First we define an $\mathcal{A}$-graph $\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$. The set of primary vertices of $\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$ is $V_P\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2) := V_P\Psi_{o_1}(H_1) \times V_P\Psi_{o_2}(H_2)$. Let

$$\tau_i : V_P\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2) \to V_P\Psi_{o_i}(H_i)$$

denote the projection map, $\tau_i((v_1, v_2)) = v_i$, $i = 1, 2$.

The set of secondary vertices $V_S\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$ of $\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$ consists of equivalence classes $[u]_\alpha$, where $u \in V_P\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$, $\alpha \in I$, with respect to the minimal equivalence relation generated by the following relation $\overset{\alpha}{\sim}$ on the set $V_P\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$. Define $v \overset{\alpha}{\sim} w$ if and only if there are edges $e_i, f_i \in E\Psi_{o_i}(H_i)$ such that

$$(e_i)_- = \tau_i(v),\ (f_i)_- = \tau_i(w),\ (e_i)_+ = (f_i)_+$$

for each $i = 1, 2$, the edges e_i, f_i have type α, and $\varphi(e_1)\varphi(f_1)^{-1} = \varphi(e_2)\varphi(f_2)^{-1}$ in G_α. It is easy to see that the relation $\overset{\alpha}{\sim}$ is symmetric and transitive on pairs and triples of distinct elements (but it could lack the reflexive property).

The edges in $\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$ are defined so that $u \in V_P\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$ and $[v]_\alpha \in V_S\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$ are connected by an edge if and only if $u \in [v]_\alpha$.

The type $\theta([v]_\alpha)$ of a vertex $[v]_\alpha \in V_S\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$ is α and if $e \in E\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$, $e_- = u$, $e_+ = [v]_\alpha$, then $\varphi(e) := \varphi(e_1)$, where $e_1 \in E\Psi_{o_1}(H_1)$ is an edge of type α with $(e_1)_- = \tau_1(u)$, when such an e_1 exists, and $\varphi(e_1) := g_\alpha$, where $g_\alpha \in G_\alpha$, $g_\alpha \neq 1$, otherwise.

It follows from the definitions and properties (P1)–(P2) of $\Psi_{o_i}(H_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, that $\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$ is an $\mathcal{A}$-graph with properties (P1)–(P2). Hence, taking the core of $\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$, we obtain a finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph which we denote by $\Psi(H_1, H_2)$ or by $\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Psi(H_2))$.

It is not difficult to see that, when taking the connected component $\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2, o)$ of $\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2)$ that contains the vertex $o = (o_1, o_2)$ and inductively removing from $\Psi'_o(H_1, H_2, o)$ vertices of degree 1 different from o, we obtain an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph $\Psi_o(H_1 \cap H_2)$ with the base vertex o that corresponds to the intersection $H_1 \cap H_2$ as in Lemma 2.1.

It follows from the definitions and property (P1) for $\Psi(H_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, that, for every edge $e \in E\Psi(H_1, H_2)$ with $e_- \in V_P\Psi(H_1, H_2)$, there are unique edges $e_i \in E\Psi(H_i)$ such that $\tau_i(e_-) = (e_i)_-$, $i = 1, 2$. Hence, by setting $\tau_i(e) = e_i$,

$\tau_i(e_+) = (e_i)_+$, $i = 1, 2$, we extend τ_i to the graph map

$$\tau_i : \Psi(H_1, H_2) \to \Psi(H_i), \quad i = 1, 2\,. \tag{2.1}$$

It follows from the definitions that τ_i is locally injective and τ_i preserves syllables of the word $\varphi(p)$ for every path p with primary vertices p_-, p_+.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose H_1, H_2 are finitely generated factor-free subgroups of the free product $\mathcal{F}$ and $S(H_1, H_2) \neq \varnothing$. Then the connected components of the graph $\Psi(H_1, H_2)$ are core graphs $\Psi(H_1 \cap sH_2s^{-1})$ of subgroups $H_1 \cap sH_2s^{-1}$, $s \in S(H_1, H_2)$. In particular, $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2) := \sum_{s \in S(H_1, H_2)} \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap sH_2s^{-1}) = -\chi(\Psi(H_1, H_2))$.*

Proof. This is straightforward, details can be found in [18]. □

3. The system of linear inequalities SLI[Y_1]

In this Section, we let $\mathcal{F}_2 = G_1 * G_2$ be the free product of two nontrivial groups G_1, G_2, let $\mathcal{A} = G_1 \cup G_2$ be the alphabet, $G_1 \cap G_2 = \{1\}$, and let Y_1 be a finite connected irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph such that $\mathrm{core}(Y_1) = Y_1$ and $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1) := -\chi(Y_1) > 0$. In particular, Y_1 has no vertices of degree 1 and Y_1 contains a vertex of degree > 2.

Let $S_2(G_\alpha)$, where $\alpha = 1, 2$, denote the set of all finite subsets of G_α of cardinality ≥ 2 and let $S_1(V_PY_1)$ denote the set of all nonempty subsets of V_PY_1. For every $T \in S_2(G_\alpha)$, consider a function

$$\Omega_T : T \to S_1(V_PY_1).$$

We also consider a relation $\sim_{\Omega_T}$ on the set of all pairs (a, u), where $a \in T$ and $u \in \Omega_T(a)$, defined as follows. Two pairs (a, u), (b, v) are related by $\sim_{\Omega_T}$, written $(a, u) \sim_{\Omega_T} (b, v)$, if and only if the following holds. Either $(a, u) = (b, v)$ or, otherwise, there exist edges $e, f \in EY_1$ with the properties that $e_- = u$, $f_- = v$, the secondary vertex $e_+ = f_+$ has type α, and $\varphi(e)\varphi(f)^{-1} = ab^{-1}$ in G_α, see an example depicted in Fig. 3.1. It is easy to see that the relation $\sim_{\Omega_T}$ is an equivalence one.

$$\begin{aligned}
T &= \{g_1, g_2, g_3, g_4\} \subseteq G_\alpha,\\
\Omega_T(g_1) &= \{u_1, u_2, u_3\},\\
\Omega_T(g_2) &= \{u_3, u_4, u_5\},\\
\Omega_T(g_3) &= \{u_1, u_6, u_7\},\\
\Omega_T(g_4) &= \{u_2, u_5, u_8\},\\
\Omega_T(g_i) &\subseteq V_PY_1,\ \varphi(e_i) = g_i,\ i = 1, 2, 3, 4,\\
(g_1, u_2) &\sim_{\Omega_T} (g_2, u_4) \sim_{\Omega_T} (g_3, u_6) \sim_{\Omega_T} (g_4, u_5).
\end{aligned}$$



Fig. 3.1

Let $[(a, u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_T}}$ denote the equivalence class of (a, u) and let $|[(a, u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_T}}|$ denote the cardinality of $[(a, u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_T}}$. It follows from the definitions that

$$1 \leq |[(a, u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_T}}| \leq |T|. \tag{3.1}$$

We will say that the equivalence class $[(a,u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_T}}$ is *associated* with a secondary vertex $w \in V_S Y_1$ of type α if $w = e_+$, where $e \in EY_1$ and $e_- = u$. It is easy to see that the definition of w is independent of u in $[(a,u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_T}}$.

A function $\Omega_T : T \to S_1(V_P Y_1)$, $T \in S_2(G_\alpha)$, is called α-*admissible* if

$$|[(a,u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_T}}| \geq 2$$

for every equivalence class $[(a,u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_T}}$, where $a \in T$, $u \in \Omega_T(a)$. The set of all α-admissible functions is denoted $\Omega(Y_1, \alpha)$, $\alpha = 1, 2$.

Let $\Omega_T \in \Omega(Y_1, \alpha)$ be an α-admissible function, $T \in S_2(G_\alpha)$, and let

$$N_\alpha(\Omega_T) := \sum (|[(a,u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_T}}| - 2) \tag{3.2}$$

denote the sum of cardinalities minus two over all equivalence classes $[(a,u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_T}}$, where $a \in T$ and $u \in \Omega_T(a)$, of the equivalence relation $\sim_{\Omega_T}$.

Let r be the number of all equivalence classes $[(a,u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_T}}$ of the equivalence relation $\sim_{\Omega_T}$, where $a \in T$ and $u \in \Omega_T(a)$. If $r \geq |V_P Y_1|$, then it follows from (3.2) and definitions that

$$N_\alpha(\Omega_T) = \sum (|[(a,u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_T}}| - 2) \leq |T| \cdot |V_P Y_1| - 2r \leq (|T| - 2)|V_P Y_1|.$$

On the other hand, if $r \leq |V_P Y_1|$, then it follows from (3.1) and (3.2) that

$$N_\alpha(\Omega_T) = \sum (|[(a,u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_T}}| - 2) \leq (|T| - 2)r \leq (|T| - 2)|V_P Y_1|.$$

Thus, in any case, it is shown that

$$N_\alpha(\Omega_T) \leq (|T| - 2)|V_P Y_1|. \tag{3.3}$$

For every $A \in S_1(V_P Y_1)$, we consider a variable x_A. We also introduce a special variable x_s. Now we will define a system of linear inequalities in these variables. For every α-admissible function Ω_T, where $T \in S_2(G_\alpha)$, $\alpha = 1, 2$, denote $T = \{b_1, \ldots, b_k\}$ and set $A_i := \Omega_T(b_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$. If $\alpha = 1$, then the inequality, corresponding to the α-admissible function Ω_T, is defined as follows

$$-x_{A_1} - \cdots - x_{A_k} - (k-2)x_s \leq -N_1(\Omega_T). \tag{3.4}$$

If $\alpha = 2$, then the inequality corresponding to the α-admissible function Ω_T is written in the following form

$$x_{A_1} + \cdots + x_{A_k} - (k-2)x_s \leq -N_2(\Omega_T). \tag{3.5}$$

Let $d \geq 3$ be an integer and $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$ denote the system of linear inequalities (3.4)–(3.5) over all α-admissible functions Ω_T, $\Omega_T \in \Omega(Y_1, \alpha)$, $\alpha = 1, 2$. Since the set $S_2(G_\alpha)$ is in general infinite (unless G_α is finite) and the set $S_1(V_P Y_1)$ is finite (because Y_1 is finite), it follows that $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$ is an infinite system of linear inequalities with integer coefficients over a finite set of variables $x_A, A \in S_1(V_P Y_1)$, x_s.

Let

$$\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1] \tag{3.6}$$

denote the subsystem of the system $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$ whose linear inequalities (3.4)–(3.5) are defined for all α-admissible functions Ω_T, $\Omega_T \in \Omega(Y_1, \alpha)$, $\alpha = 1, 2$, such that $|T| \leq d$. If q is an inequality of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ then the coefficient of x_s in the left-hand side of q is an integer $-k + 2$, where $2 \leq k = |T| \leq d$, and the right-hand side of q is an integer $-N_\alpha(\Omega_T)$, where $0 \leq N_\alpha(\Omega_T) \leq (d-2)|V_P Y_1|$, as follows from inequality (3.3). Also, the number of subsets $A \subseteq V_P Y_1$ that index variables $\pm x_A$ in

the left-hand side of q is finite and the total number of occurrences of such variables $\pm x_A$ in q is $k = |T| \le d$. Therefore, $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ is a finite system of linear inequalities and $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1] = \cup_{d=3}^{\infty} \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$.

Let Y_2 be a finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph. Consider the following property of Y_2.

(B) The map $\tau_2 : \mathrm{core}(Y_1 \times Y_2) \to Y_2$ is surjective, $\mathrm{core}(Y_2) = Y_2$, and $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2) := -\chi(Y_2) > 0$.

If Γ is a finite graph, let $\deg \Gamma$ denote the maximum of degrees of vertices of Γ. We will also use one more property.

(Bd) Y_2 has property (B) and $\deg Y_2 \le d$, where $d \ge 3$ is an integer.

Suppose Y_2 is a graph with property (B). For every secondary vertex $u \in V_S Y_2$ of type α, consider all edges $e_1, \dots, e_\ell$, where $\deg u = \ell$, such that $u = (e_1)_+ = \dots = (e_\ell)_+$ and denote $v_j = (e_j)_-$, $j = 1, \dots, \ell$. Define $T_u := \{\varphi(e_1), \dots, \varphi(e_\ell)\}$. Clearly, $T_u \subseteq S_2(G_\alpha)$. Define the sets $A_j := \tau_1 \tau_2^{-1}(v_j) \subseteq V_P Y_1$ for $j = 1, \dots, \ell$ and consider the function

$$\Omega_{T_u} : T_u \to S_1(V_P Y_1)$$

so that $\Omega_{T_u}(\varphi(e_j)) = A_j$.

It is easy to check that Ω_{T_u} is α-admissible. Since every α-admissible function $\Omega \in \Omega(Y_1, \alpha)$ gives rise to an inequality (3.4) if $\alpha = 1$ or to an inequality (3.5) if $\alpha = 2$ and every secondary vertex $u \in V_S Y_2$ of type α defines, as indicated above, an α-admissible function Ω_{T_u}, it follows that every $u \in V_S Y_2$ is mapped to a certain inequality of the system $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$, denoted $\mathsf{inq}_S(u)$. Thus we obtain a function

$$\mathsf{inq}_S : V_S Y_2 \to \mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$$

defined from the set $V_S Y_2$ of secondary vertices of a finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph Y_2 with property (B) to the set of inequalities of $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$.

If q is an inequality of the system $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$, denoted $q \in \mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$, we let q^L denote the left-hand side of q and let q^R denote the integer in the right-hand side of q.

Lemma 3.1. *In the foregoing notation, if* $\deg u \le d$ *for every* $u \in V_S Y_2$, *then* $\mathit{inq}_S(V_S Y_2) \subseteq \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$. *Furthermore,*

$$\sum_{u \in V_S Y_2} \mathit{inq}_S(u)^L = -2\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2) x_s\,, \ \textit{and} \ \sum_{u \in V_S Y_2} \mathit{inq}_S(u)^R = -2\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1 \times Y_2)).$$

Proof. The inclusion $\mathsf{inq}_S(V_S Y_2) \subseteq \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ is evident from the definitions.

Suppose $v \in V_P Y_2$ and let e_1, e_2 be the edges such that $(e_1)_- = (e_2)_- = v$ and $\varphi(e_\alpha) \in G_\alpha$, $\alpha = 1, 2$. Clearly, $u_\alpha := (e_\alpha)_+$, $\alpha = 1, 2$, is a secondary vertex of Y_2. Denote $A_v := \tau_1 \tau_2^{-1}(v)$. It follows from the definitions that $A_v \in S_1(V_P Y_1)$ and that the variables $-x_{A_v}$, x_{A_v} occur in $\mathsf{inq}_S(u_1)^L$, $\mathsf{inq}_S(u_2)^L$, resp., and will cancel out in the sum $\mathsf{inq}_S(u_1)^L + \mathsf{inq}_S(u_2)^L$. It is easy to see that all occurrences of variables $\pm x_A$, $A \in S_1(V_P Y_1)$, in the formal sum

$$\sum_{u \in V_S Y_2} \mathsf{inq}_S(u)^L,$$

before any cancelations are made, can be paired down by using primary vertices of Y_2 as indicated above. Since every secondary vertex u of Y_2 contributes $-(\deg u - 2)$ to the coefficient of x_s in $\sum_{u \in V_S Y_2} \mathsf{inq}_S(u)^L$ and

$$\sum_{u \in V_S Y_2} (\deg u - 2) = 2\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2), \tag{3.7}$$

the first equality of Lemma 3.1 becomes evident. The second equality follows from the analogous to (3.7) formula

$$\sum_{u\in V_S(\mathrm{core}(Y_1\times Y_2))}(\deg u-2)=2\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1\times Y_2)),$$

and from the definition (3.2) of numbers $N_\alpha(\Omega(u))$, $u\in V_SY_2$. □

Let $A=\{a_1,\dots,a_n\}$ be a finite set. A *combination with repetitions* B of A, which we denote $B=[[b_1,\dots,b_m]]$, is a finite unordered collection of multiple copies of elements of A. Hence $b_i\in A$ and $b_i=b_j$ is possible for $i\neq j$.

Observe that a finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph Y_2 with property (Bd) can be used to construct a combination with repetitions, denoted $\mathsf{inq}(V_SY_2)$ (note that, in general, $\mathsf{inq}(V_SY_2)\neq\mathsf{inq}_S(V_SY_2)$ as $\mathsf{inq}_S(V_SY_2)\subseteq\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$), of the system $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$, whose elements are individual inequalities of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ so that every inequality $q=\mathsf{inq}_S(u)$ of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ occurs in $\mathsf{inq}(V_SY_2)$ as many times as the number of preimages of q in V_SY_2 under inq_S. It follows from Lemma 3.1 that if $\mathsf{inq}(V_SY_2)=[[q_1,\dots,q_m]]$, then

$$\sum_{q\in\mathsf{inq}(V_SY_2)}q^L:=\sum_{j=1}^m q_j^L=-2\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2)x_s.$$

In the opposite direction, we will prove the following.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose Q is a nonempty combination with repetitions of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ and*

$$\sum_{q\in Q}q^L=-Cx_s, \tag{3.8}$$

where $C>0$ is an integer. Then there exists a finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph Y_Q such that Y_Q has property (Bd) and $\mathsf{inq}(V_SY_Q)=Q$. In particular,

$$\sum_{q\in\mathsf{inq}(V_SY_Q)}q^L=-2\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_Q)x_s\quad\text{and}\quad\sum_{q\in\mathsf{inq}(V_SY_Q)}q^R=-2\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1\times Y_Q)). \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. We will construct an $\mathcal{A}$-graph Y_Q whose set V_SY_Q of secondary vertices is in bijective correspondence $u_j\to q_j$, $j=1,\dots,m$, with elements of $Q=[[q_1,\dots,q_m]]$ so that vertices of type α in V_SY_Q correspond to inequalities of type α in Q, see (3.4)–(3.5). To fix notation, we let the inequality q_j be defined by means of an α_j-admissible function

$$\Omega_j:T_j\to S_1(V_PY_1),$$

where $T_j\in S_2(G_{\alpha_j})$, $T_j=\{b_{1,j},\dots,b_{k_j,j}\}$, $2\le k_j\le d$, $b_{\ell,j}\in G_{\alpha_j}$.

Consider a secondary vertex u_j of type α_j and k_j edges $e_{1,j},\dots,e_{k_j,j}$ whose terminal vertex is u_j and whose labels are $\varphi(e_{1,j})=b_{1,j},\dots,\varphi(e_{k_j,j})=b_{k_j,j}$. This is a local structure of the graph Y_Q around its secondary vertices. Now we will identify in pairs initial vertices of edges $e_{1,j},\dots,e_{k_j,j}$, $j=1,\dots,m$, which will form the set of primary vertices V_PY_Q of the graph Y_Q. In the notation introduced above, it follows from the definitions (3.4)–(3.5) that a typical term $\pm x_A$ of q_j^L has the form $(-1)^{\alpha_j}x_A$, where $A=\Omega_j(b_{\ell,j})$ for some $\ell=1,\dots,k_j$.

It follows from equality (3.8) that there is an involution map ι on the set of $\pm x_A$ terms of the formal sum $\sum_{j=1}^m q_j^L$ that takes every term $\pm x_A$ of q_j^L to a term $\mp x_A$ of $q_{j'}^L$, $j\neq j'$, and $\iota^2=\mathrm{id}$. Therefore, if

$$(-1)^{\alpha_j}x_{\Omega_j(b_{\ell,j})}\quad\text{and}\quad(-1)^{\alpha_{j'}}x_{\Omega_{j'}(b_{\ell',j'})}$$

are two terms of the formal sum $\sum_{j=1}^m q_j^L$ which are ι-images of each other, then $\{\alpha_j, \alpha_{j'}\} = \{1, 2\}$ and $\Omega_j(b_{\ell,j}) = \Omega_{j'}(b_{\ell',j'})$. We identify the initial vertices of the edges $e_{\ell,j}$, $e_{\ell',j'}$ so that $(e_{\ell,j})_- = (e_{\ell',j'})_-$ becomes a primary vertex of Y_Q. Doing this identification for initial vertices of the pairs of edges, corresponding as above to all pairs of canceling symbols $\pm x_A$, $\mp x_A$ in $\sum_{j=1}^m q_j^L$, results in an $\mathcal{A}$-graph Y_Q. It is not difficult to see from the definitions and from α-admissibility of functions $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_m$ that Y_Q is a finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph with $\mathrm{core}(Y_Q) = Y_Q$, that $\mathsf{inq}(V_S Y_Q) = Q$, and that the map

$$\tau_Q : \mathrm{core}(Y_1 \times Y_Q) \to Y_Q$$

is surjective. Note that the map τ_Q is the analogue of τ_2, see (2.1). Hence, Y_Q has property (B). Clearly, $\deg u \le d$ for every $u \in V_S Y_Q$, whence Y_Q also has property (Bd). The equalities (3.9) follow from Lemma 3.1. □

We summarize Lemmas 3.1–3.2 in the following.

Lemma 3.3. *The function $\mathsf{inq} : Y_2 \to \mathsf{inq}(V_S Y_2) = Q$ from the set of finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graphs Y_2 with property (Bd) to the set of combinations Q with repetitions of the system $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ with the property $\sum_{q\in Q} q^L = -Cx_s$, where $C > 0$ is an integer, is surjective. In addition, if $\mathsf{inq}(V_S Y_2) = Q$ then*

$$\sum_{q\in Q} q^L = -2\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2)x_s \quad \textit{and} \quad \sum_{q\in Q} q^R = -2\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1 \times Y_2)).$$

Proof. This is straightforward from Lemmas 3.1–3.2 and their proofs. □

4. Utilizing Linear and Linear Semi-infinite Programming

First we briefly review relevant results from the theory of linear programming (LP) over the field $\mathbb{Q}$ of rational numbers. Following the notation of Schrijver's monograph [25], let $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{m\times n}$ be an $m \times n$-matrix, let $b \in \mathbb{Q}^{n\times 1} = \mathbb{Q}^n$ be a column vector, let $c \in \mathbb{Q}^{1\times n}$ be a row vector, $c = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$, and let x be a column vector consisting of variables $x_1, \dots, x_n$, so $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^\top$, where $M^\top$ means the transpose of a matrix M. The inequality $x \ge 0$ means that $x_i \ge 0$ for every i.

A typical LP-problem asks about the maximal value of the objective linear functional

$$cx = c_1x_1 + \cdots + c_nx_n$$

over all $x \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ subject to a finite system of linear inequalities $Ax \le b$. This value (and often the LP-problem itself) is denoted

$$\max\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}.$$

We write $\max\{cx \mid Ax \le b\} = -\infty$ if the set $\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ is empty. We write $\max\{cx \mid Ax \le b\} = +\infty$ if the set $\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ is unbounded from above and say that $\max\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ is finite if the set $\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ is nonempty and bounded from above. The notation and terminology for an LP-problem

$$\min\{cx \mid Ax \le b\} = -\max\{-cx \mid Ax \le b\}$$

is analogous with $-\infty$ and $+\infty$ interchanged.

If $\max\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ is an LP-problem as defined above, then the problem

$$\min\{b^\top y \mid A^\top y = c^\top, y \ge 0\},$$

where $y = (y_1, \dots, y_m)^\top$, is called the *dual* problem of the *primal* LP-problem $\max\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$.

The (weak) duality theorem of linear programming can be stated as follows, see [25, Sect. 7.4].

Theorem A. *Let* $\max\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ *be an LP-problem and let* $\min\{b^\top y \mid A^\top y = c^\top, y \ge 0\}$ *be its dual LP-problem. Then for every* $x \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ *such that* $Ax \le b$ *and every* $y \in \mathbb{Q}^m$ *such that* $A^\top y = c^\top, y \ge 0$*, one has* $cx \le y^\top Ax \le b^\top y$ *and*

$$\max\{cx \mid Ax \le b\} = \min\{b^\top y \mid A^\top y = c^\top, y \ge 0\} \tag{4.1}$$

provided both polyhedra $\{x \mid Ax \le b\}$ *and* $\{y \mid A^\top y = c^\top, y \ge 0\}$ *are not empty. In addition, the minimum, whenever it is finite, is attained at a vector* $\widehat{y}$ *which is a vertex of the polyhedron* $\{y \mid A^\top y = c^\top, y \ge 0\}$.

Since the system of inequalities $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$, as defined in Sect. 3, is infinite in general, we also recall basic terminology and results regarding duality in linear semi-infinite programming (LSIP), see [2], [3], [9]. Consider a generalized LP-problem $\max\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ that has countably many linear inequalities in the system $Ax \le b$ while the number of variables in x is still finite. Hence, in this setting, A is a matrix with countably many rows and n columns, or $A \in \mathbb{Q}^{\infty\times n}$ is an $\infty \times n$-matrix, $b \in \mathbb{Q}^{\infty\times 1} = \mathbb{Q}^\infty$, or b is an infinite column vector, $c \in \mathbb{Q}^{1\times n}$ is a row vector, and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^\top$.

A typical LSIP-problem over $\mathbb{Q}$ asks about the supremum of the objective linear functional cx over all $x \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ subject to $Ax \le b$. This number and the problem itself is denoted $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$. As above, we write $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\} = -\infty$ if the set $\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ is empty, $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\} = +\infty$ if the set $\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ is not bounded from above and say that $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ is finite if the set $\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ is nonempty and bounded from above. The notation and terminology for an LSIP-problem $\inf\{cx \mid Ax \le b\} = -\sup\{-cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ is analogous with $-\infty$ and $+\infty$ interchanged. Let A_i denote the submatrix of A of size $i \times n$ whose first i rows are those of A and b_i is the the starting subcolumn of b of length i. Then $\max\{cx \mid A_i x \le b_i\}$ is an LP-problem which is called the *i-approximate* of the LSIP-problem $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$.

Let $M_i = \max\{cx \mid A_i x \le b_i\}$ denote the optimal value of the i-approximate LP-problem $\max\{cx \mid A_i x \le b_i\}$ and M is the number $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$. Clearly, for every i, $M_i \ge M_{i+1} \ge M$. Note that in general $\lim_{i\to\infty} M_i \ne M$, see [2, 3].

Similarly to [2], [3], [9], we say that if $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ is an LSIP-problem as above, then the problem

$$\inf\{b^\top y \mid A^\top y = c^\top, y \ge 0\},$$

where $y = (y_1, y_2, \dots)^\top$ is an infinite vector whose set of nonzero components is finite, is called the *dual problem* of $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$.

For later reference, we state an analogue of Theorem A for linear semi-infinite programming which, in fact, is an easy corollary of Theorem A.

Theorem B. *Suppose that* $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ *is an LSIP-problem whose set* $\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ *is nonempty and bounded from above and whose dual problem is* $\inf\{b^\top y \mid A^\top y = c^\top, y \ge 0\}$*. Then*

$$\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\} \le \inf\{b^\top y \mid A^\top y = c^\top, y \ge 0\} \tag{4.2}$$

and the equality holds if and only if $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ *is equal to* $\lim_{i\to\infty} M_i$*, where* $M_i := \max\{cx \mid A_i x \le b_i\}$ *is the optimal solution of the* i*-approximate LP-problem* $\max\{cx \mid A_i x \le b_i\}$ *of the primal LSIP-problem* $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$.

In the situation when the inequality (4.2) is strict, the difference $\inf\{b^\top y \mid A^\top y = c^\top, y \ge 0\} - \sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\} > 0$ is called the *duality gap* of the LSIP-problem $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$.

We will also need a corollary of the complementary slackness and Carathéodory theorem, see [25, Corollary 7.11].

Theorem C. *If both optima in* (4.1) *are finite, then the minimum is attained at a vector* $\widehat{y}$*,* $\widehat{y} \ge 0$*, whose positive components correspond to linear independent columns of* $A^\top$*, i.e., rows of* A.

We now consider the problem of maximizing the objective linear functional $cx := -x_s$ over all rational vectors x, $x \in \mathbb{Q}^{n'}$, for a suitable n', subject to the system of linear inequalities $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$, as an LP-problem $\max\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$. Note that, in this context, $m' = m_{\mathsf{inq}}$ and $n' = n_{\mathsf{inq}}$, where m_{inq} is the number of inequalities in $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$ and n_{inq} is the number of all variables $x_{j,A}, x_s$ in $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$.

We now consider the problem of maximizing the objective linear functional

$$cx := -x_s$$

over all rational vectors x, $x \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ for a suitable n, subject to the system of linear inequalities $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$ introduced in Sect. 3, as an LSIP-problem $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$.

We also consider a subsequence of i_d-approximate LP-problems $\max\{cx \mid A_{i_d} x \le b_{i_d}\}$ of the LSIP-problem $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ whose systems $A_{i_d} x \le b_{i_d}$ of inequalities are finite subsystems $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ of $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$, where $d = 3, 4, \ldots$, as defined in (3.6).

It is straightforward to verify that the dual problem $\inf\{b^\top y \mid A^\top y = c^\top, y \ge 0\}$ of this LSIP-problem $\sup\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ can be equivalently stated as follows

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j q_j^R \to \inf \quad \text{subject to} \quad y \ge 0, \ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j q_j^L = -x_s, \tag{4.3}$$

where almost all y_j, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$, are 0's. We rewrite (4.3) in the form

$$\inf\{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j q_j^R \mid \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j q_j^L = -x_s, y \ge 0\}. \tag{4.4}$$

Analogously, the dual problem of the i_d-approximate LP-problem $\max\{cx \mid A_{i_d} x \le b_{i_d}\}$ can be stated in the form

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^R \to \min \quad \text{subject to} \quad y \ge 0, \ \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s$$

which we will write as

$$\min\{\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^R \mid \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s, y \ge 0\}. \tag{4.5}$$

In Lemma 3.3, we established the existence of a surjective function

$$\mathsf{inq} : Y_2 \to \mathsf{inq}(Y_2)$$

from the set of finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graphs Y_2 with property (Bd) to a certain set of combinations with repetitions of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$. Now we will relate these combinations with repetitions of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ to solutions of the dual LP-problem (4.5).

Consider a combination with repetitions Q of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ that has the property

$$\sum_{q\in Q} q^L = -C(Q)x_s, \tag{4.6}$$

where $C(Q) > 0$ is an integer. As before, let all inequalities of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ be $q_1, \dots, q_{i_d}$, let $\ell_j(Q)$ denote the number of times that q_j occurs in Q, and let δ_j be the coefficient of x_s in q_j. Then it follows from the definitions and (4.6) that

$$\sum_{q\in Q} q^L = \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} \delta_j \ell_j(Q) x_s = -C(Q)x_s. \tag{4.7}$$

Consider the map

$$\mathsf{sol}_d : Q \to y_Q = (y_{Q,1}, \dots, y_{Q,i_d})^\top, \tag{4.8}$$

where $y_{Q,j} := \frac{\ell_j(Q)}{C(Q)}$ for $j = 1, \dots, i_d$. It follows from the definitions that y_Q is a rational vector, $y_Q \geq 0$ and, by (4.7), y_Q satisfies the condition

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_{Q,j} q_j^L = -x_s.$$

Hence, y_Q is a vector in the polyhedron $\{y \mid y \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\}$ of the dual LP-problem (4.5).

Conversely, let $\widehat{y} = (\widehat{y}_1, \dots, \widehat{y}_{i_d})^\top$ be a vector of the feasible polyhedron

$$\{y \mid y \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\}$$

of the dual LP-problem (4.5). Let $C > 0$ be a common multiple of positive denominators of the rational numbers $\widehat{y}_1, \dots, \widehat{y}_{i_d}$. Consider a combination with repetitions $Q = Q(\widehat{y})$ of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ such that every q_j of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ occurs in Q $C\widehat{y}_j = \ell_j$ many times. Then it follows from the definitions that

$$\sum_{q\in Q} q^L = \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} \ell_j q_j^L = \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} C\widehat{y}_j q_j^L = C \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} \widehat{y}_j q_j^L = -Cx_s.$$

Now we can see that the vector $y_Q = \mathsf{sol}_d(Q(\widehat{y}))$, defined by (4.8) for Q, is equal to $\widehat{y}$, i.e., $\mathsf{sol}_d(Q(\widehat{y})) = \widehat{y}$.

We now summarize our findings.

Lemma 4.1. *The map $\mathsf{sol}_d : Q \to y_Q$ defined by (4.8) is a surjective function from the set of combinations Q with repetitions of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ that satisfy an equation $\sum_{q\in Q} q^L = -Cx_s$, where $C > 0$ is an integer, to the set of vectors of the rational polyhedron $\{y \mid y \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\}$ of the dual LP-problem (4.5). Furthermore, the composition of the maps inq and sol_d, $\mathsf{sol}_d \circ \mathsf{inq} : Y_2 \to \widehat{y} = \widehat{y}(Y_2)$, provides a surjective function from the set of finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graphs with property (Bd) to the set of points of the rational polyhedron $\{y \mid y \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\}$*

of the dual LP-problem (4.5). *Under this map, the value of the objective function* $\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} \widehat{y}_j q_j^R$ *of the dual LP-problem* (4.5) *at* $\widehat{y} = \widehat{y}(Y_2)$ *satisfies*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} \widehat{y}_j q_j^R = -\frac{\overline{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1 \times Y_2))}{\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2)}. \tag{4.9}$$

Proof. As was observed above, sol_d is surjective, hence, by Lemma 3.3, the composition $\mathsf{sol}_d \circ \mathsf{inq}$ is also surjective. Consider a finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph Y_2 with property (Bd) and define $Q := \mathsf{inq}(Y_2)$, $\widehat{y} := \mathsf{sol}_d(Q)$. It follows from Lemma 3.3 that

$$\sum_{q \in Q} q^L = -2\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2)x_s \quad \text{ and } \quad \sum_{q \in Q} q^R = -2\overline{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1 \times Y_2)). \tag{4.10}$$

In view of the definition (4.7) and Lemma 3.3, we have $C(Q) = 2\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2)$. Hence, it follows from the definition (4.8) and equalities (4.10) that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} \widehat{y}_j q_j^R = (\sum_{q \in Q} q^R) C(Q)^{-1} = -\frac{\overline{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1 \times Y_2))}{\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2)},$$

as required. □

We will say that a real number $\sigma(Y_1) \geq 0$ is the *Walter Neumann coefficient*, or briefly WN-coefficient, for Y_1 if

$$\overline{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1 \times Y_2)) \leq \sigma(Y_1)\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1)\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2)$$

for every finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph Y_2 with property (B) and $\sigma(Y_1)$ is minimal with this property.

We also consider the WN_d-coefficient $\sigma_d(Y_1)$, where $d \geq 3$ is an integer, for Y_1 defined so that

$$\overline{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1 \times Y_2)) \leq \sigma_d(Y_1)\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1)\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2)$$

for every finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph Y_2 with property (Bd) and $\sigma_d(Y_1)$ is minimal with this property. It is clear from the definitions that $\sigma_d(Y_1) \leq \sigma_{d+1}(Y_1) \leq \sigma(Y_1)$ for every $d = 3, 4, \ldots$, that $\sigma(Y_1) = \sup \frac{\overline{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1 \times Y_2))}{\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1)\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2)}$ over all finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graphs Y_2 with property (B) and that $\sigma_d(Y_1) = \sup \frac{\overline{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1 \times Y_2'))}{\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1)\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2')}$ over all finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graphs Y_2' with property (Bd).

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose* $d \geq \max\{\deg u \mid u \in V_S Y_1\} = \deg Y_1$ *is an integer. Then both optima* $\max\{-x_s \mid \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]\}$ *and* $\min\{\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^R \mid y \geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\}$ *are finite and satisfy the following inequalities and equalities*

$$-2\tfrac{q^*}{q^*-2}\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1) \leq \sup\{-x_s \mid \mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]\} \leq \max\{-x_s \mid \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]\} =$$
$$= \min\{\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^R \mid y \geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\} = -\sigma_d(Y_1)\overline{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1). \tag{4.11}$$

Furthermore, the minimum is attained at a vector $\widehat{y}(d)$, $\widehat{y}(d) \geq 0$, which is a vertex of the polyhedron $\{y \mid y \geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\}$ and

$$\inf\{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j q_j^R \mid y \geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\} = -\sigma(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1)$$
$$\leq \min\{\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^R \mid y \geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\} = -\sigma_d(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1). \quad (4.12)$$

In particular, $\sigma_d(Y_1) \leq \sigma(Y_1) \leq 2\frac{q^*}{q^*-2}$.

Proof. Setting $Y_2 := Y_1$, we get a solution $\widehat{y} = \mathsf{sol}_d(\mathsf{inq}(Y_2))$ to the system $y \geq 0$, $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j q_j^L = -x_s$. Hence, both sets

$$\{y \mid y \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\}, \quad \{y \mid y \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\}$$

are not empty.

To see that the sets $\{x \mid \mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]\}$, $\{x \mid \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]\}$ are not empty either, we will show that $\widehat{x}$, whose components are $\widehat{x}_A = 0$ for every $A \subseteq V_P Y_1$ and $\widehat{x}_s = 2\frac{q^*}{q^*-2}\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1)$, is a solution both to $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ and to $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$. To do this, we will check that every inequality of $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$ is satisfied with these values of variables, that is,

$$-(k-2) \cdot 2\tfrac{q^*}{q^*-2}\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1) \leq -N_\alpha(\Omega_T) \quad (4.13)$$

for every α-admissible function $\Omega_T : T \to S_1(V_P Y_1)$, where $T \in S_2(G_\alpha)$, $|T| = k$. Let $T = \{a_1, \ldots, a_k\}$, $k \geq 2$, $a_i \in G_\alpha$, and $\Omega_T(a_i) = A_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Consider a secondary vertex u of Y_1, suppose $\deg u = \ell$ and let $e_1, \ldots, e_\ell$ be all edges of Y_1 with $u = (e_1)_+ = \cdots = (e_\ell)_+$. Denote $B := \{\varphi(e_1), \ldots, \varphi(e_\ell)\}$. It is not difficult to see from the definition (3.2) of $N_\alpha(\Omega_T)$ that the contribution to the sum $N_\alpha(\Omega_T)$ made by those equivalence classes that are associated with the vertex $u \in V_S Y_1$ does not exceed $\sum_{g \in G_\alpha} \max(|T \cap Bg| - 2, 0)$. Hence, it follows from the definition of $\frac{q^*}{q^*-2}$ and from results of Dicks and the author [6, Corollary 3.5] that

$$\sum_{g \in G_\alpha} \max(|T \cap Bg| - 2, 0) \leq \tfrac{q^*}{q^*-2}(|T| - 2)(|B| - 2) = \tfrac{q^*}{q^*-2}(k-2)(\ell - 2). \quad (4.14)$$

Therefore, summing up inequalities (4.14) over all vertices $u \in V_S Y_1$, we arrive at

$$N_\alpha(\Omega) \leq \tfrac{q^*}{q^*-2}(k-2) \cdot 2\bar{\mathrm{r}}_\alpha(Y_1) \leq \tfrac{q^*}{q^*-2}(k-2) \cdot 2\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1),$$

where $2\bar{\mathrm{r}}_\alpha(Y_1)$ is the sum $\sum(\deg u - 2)$ over all $u \in V_S Y_2$ of type α. This proves (4.13) and also shows that

$$-x_s \geq -\tfrac{2q^*}{q^*-2}\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1).$$

Thus, according to Theorem A, the maximum and minimum in (4.11) are finite and equal. Inequalities in (4.11) are shown. Recall that, by Theorem A, the minimum $\min\{\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^R \mid y \geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\}$ is attained at a vertex $\widehat{y}(d)$ of the polyhedron $\{y \mid y \geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\}$.

By Lemma 4.1, for every irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph Y_2 with property (Bd), the ratio $-\frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1\times Y_2))}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2)}$ is $\sum_{j=1}^{i_d}\widehat{y}_j q_j^R$, where $\widehat{y}=\mathsf{sol}_d(\mathsf{inq}(Y_2))$, and the map

$$\mathsf{sol}_d\circ\mathsf{inq}: Y_2\to\widehat{y}$$

covers the feasible polyhedron $\{y \mid y\geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L=-x_s\}$. Hence, the supremum

$$\sigma_d(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1):=\sup_{Y_2}\frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1\times Y_2))}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2)}=-\inf_{Y_2}\left(-\frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1\times Y_2))}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2)}\right)$$

over all graphs Y_2 with property (Bd) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_d(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1)&=-\inf\{\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^R \mid y\geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L=-x_s\}\\&=-\min\{\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^R \mid y\geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L=-x_s\}\\&=-\sum_{j=1}^{i_d}\widehat{y}_j(d)q_j^R=-\max\{-x_s\mid \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]\},\end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{y}(d)$ is a vertex of the polyhedron $\{y \mid y\geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L=-x_s\}$ at which the minimum is attained.

Since

$$\inf\{\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j q_j^R \mid y\geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} y_j q_j^L=-x_s\}=\inf_d\min\{\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^R \mid y\geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L=-x_s\}$$

and $\sigma(Y_1)=\sup_d(\sigma_d(Y_1))$, the equalities and inequalities (4.12) follow from proven equalities and inequalities (4.11). □

5. More Lemmas

We now let $\mathcal{F}=\prod_{\alpha\in I}^{*} G_\alpha$ be an arbitrary free product of nontrivial groups G_α, $\alpha\in I$, $|I|>1$. Let H be a finitely generated factor-free subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$. As in Sect. 2, let $\Psi_o(H)$ denote an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph of H, where $\mathcal{A}=\cup_{\alpha\in I}G_\alpha$, with the base vertex o and let $\Psi(H)$ denote the core of $\Psi_o(H)$. Let $I(H)$ denote a subset of the index set I such that $\alpha\in I(H)$ if and only if there is a secondary vertex $u\in V_S\Psi(H)$ of type α. Since H is finitely generated, it follows that $I(H)$ is finite.

We fix a finitely generated factor-free subgroup H_1 of $\mathcal{F}$ with positive reduced rank $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)=-\chi(\Psi(H_1))>0$. We say that a finitely generated factor-free subgroup H_2 of $\mathcal{F}$ has *property* (B), resp. *property* (Bd), where $d\geq 3$ is an integer, *relative* to H_1 if the core graph $\Psi(H_2)$ of H_2 has the original property (B), resp. property (Bd), in which the graphs Y_1, Y_2 are replaced with $\Psi(H_1)$, $\Psi(H_2)$, resp., i.e., $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)=-\chi(\Psi(H_2))>0$, $\deg\Psi(H_2)\leq d$ in case of property (Bd), and the map $\tau_2:\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1)\times\Psi(H_2))\to\Psi(H_2)$ is surjective.

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose H_2 is a finitely generated factor-free subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\deg\Psi(H_2)\leq d$, where $d\geq 3$ is an integer or $d=\infty$, $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)=-\chi(\Psi(H_2))>0$, and the map $\tau_2:\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1)\times\Psi(H_2))\to\Psi(H_2)$ is not surjective. Then there exists a*

finitely generated factor-free subgroup H_4 of $\mathcal{F}$ with property (Bd) if $d < \infty$ or with property (B) if $d = \infty$ such that

$$\frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_4)}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_4)} > \frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2)}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)}. \tag{5.1}$$

Proof. Recall that $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Psi(H_2)))$ and $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_i) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Psi(H_i))$, $i = 1, 2$. If $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Psi(H_2))) = 0$, then we may take $H_4 = H_1$ and the inequality (5.1) holds. Assume that $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Psi(H_2))) > 0$ and that the map

$$\tau_2 : \mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Psi(H_2)) \to \Psi(H_2)$$

is not surjective. Consider the subgraph $\Gamma := \tau_2(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Psi(H_2)))$ of $\Psi(H_2)$. It follows from the definitions and assumptions that $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma) < \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Psi(H_2))$ and

$$\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma)) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Psi(H_2))) > 0,$$

whence $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma) > 0$. It is also clear that $\mathrm{core}(\Gamma) = \Gamma$. Therefore,

$$\frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma))}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma)} > \frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Psi(H_2)))}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Psi(H_2))}. \tag{5.2}$$

Let $\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_k$ be connected components of the graph Γ. Since

$$\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma)) > 0,$$

it follows that $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma) > 0$. Note that the graph $\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma)$ consists of disjoint graphs $\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma_j)$, $j = 1, \dots, k$. In particular,

$$\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma_j), \qquad \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma)) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma_j)),$$

hence,

$$\frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma))}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma)} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k} \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma_j))}{\sum_{j=1}^{k} \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma_j)}. \tag{5.3}$$

Note that if $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma_j) = 0$ then $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma_j)) = 0$. Let Γ_{j^*} be chosen so that $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma_{j^*}) > 0$ and the ratio

$$\frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma_{j^*}))}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma_{j^*})}$$

is maximal over those graphs Γ_j with $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma_j) > 0$. It follows from $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma_j) > 0$ that such j^* does exist. It is not difficult to see that

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{k} \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma_j))}{\sum_{j=1}^{k} \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma_j)} \leq \frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma_{j^*}))}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma_{j^*})}.$$

This, together with (5.2) and (5.3), implies that

$$\frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma_{j^*}))}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma_{j^*})} \geq \frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Gamma))}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Gamma)} > \frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Psi(H_2)))}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Psi(H_2))}.$$

Hence, picking an arbitrary primary vertex $v \in V_P\Gamma_{j^*}$ in Γ_{j^*} as a base point, and letting $H_4 := H(\Gamma_{j^*}, v)$, as in Lemma 2.2, we obtain a subgroup H_4 with the desired inequality (5.1). □

Lemma 5.2. *The supremum* $\sup \frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1,H_3)}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_3)}$ *over all finitely generated factor-free subgroups* H_3 *of* $\mathcal{F}$ *with* $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_3) > 0$ *and* $\deg \Psi(H_3) \le d$, *where* $d \ge 3$ *is an integer or* $d = \infty$, *is equal to* $\sup \frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1,H_2)}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)}$ *over all finitely generated factor-free subgroups* H_2 *of* $\mathcal{F}$ *that have property (Bd) (or property (B) if* $d = \infty$*) relative to* H_1 *and satisfy the condition* $I(H_2) \subseteq I(H_1)$. *In particular,*

$$\sigma_d(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1) = \sigma_d(\Psi(H_1))\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Psi(H_1)) \quad \textit{and} \quad \sigma(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1) = \sigma(\Psi(H_1))\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\Psi(H_1)).$$

Proof. This first claim follows from Lemma 5.1 and the observation that if the map $\tau_2 : \mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1) \times \Psi(H_2)) \to \Psi(H_2)$ is surjective then $I(H_2) \subseteq I(H_1)$. The equalities follow from the first claim, definitions of numbers $\sigma_d(H_1)$, $\sigma(H_1)$, $\sigma_d(\Psi(H_1))$, $\sigma(\Psi(H_1))$, and Lemma 5.1. □

In view of Lemma 5.2, when investigating

$$\sup \frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_3)}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_3)}$$

over all finitely generated factor-free subgroups H_3 of $\mathcal{F}$ with $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_3) > 0$ and $\deg \Psi(H_3) \le d$, we may assume that the index set I is finite, i.e., $I = I(H_1)$, say, $I = \{1, \dots, m\}$, and so $\mathcal{F} = G_1 * G_2 * \dots * G_m$.

Furthermore, in order to be able to make use of results of Sects. 3–4, we consider $\mathcal{F}$ as the following free product

$$\mathcal{F}_2(1) = G_1 * G(2, m)$$

of two groups G_1 and $G(2, m) := G_2 * \dots * G_m$. Let $g_\alpha \in G_\alpha$ be some nontrivial element of G_α, $\alpha \in I = \{1, \dots, m\}$. For every $a_\alpha \in G_\alpha$, consider the map

$$a_\alpha \to (g_{\alpha+1} \dots g_m g_1 \dots g_\alpha)^{-1} a_\alpha g_{\alpha+1} \dots g_m g_1 \dots g_\alpha, \tag{5.4}$$

where $g_{\alpha+1} \dots g_m g_1 \dots g_\alpha$ is a cyclic permutation of the word $g_1 g_2 \dots g_m$.

Recall that a subgroup K of a group G is called *antinormal* if, for every $g \in G$, $gKg^{-1} \cap K \ne \{1\}$ implies $g \in K$.

Lemma 5.3. *Let* $|I| = m \ge 3$ *and let* H_1 *be a finitely generated factor-free subgroup of* $\mathcal{F}$. *Then the map* (5.4) *extends to monomorphisms*

$$\mu : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}, \qquad \mu_2 : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}_2(1)$$

that have the following properties.

(*a*) *A word* $U \in \mathcal{F}$ *with* $|U| > 1$ *is cyclically reduced if and only if* $\mu(U)$ *is cyclically reduced.*

(*b*) *The subgroups* $\mu_2(\mathcal{F})$, $\mu(\mathcal{F})$ *are antinormal in* $\mathcal{F}_2(1)$, $\mathcal{F}$, *resp.*.

(*c*) $\mu_2(H_1)$ *is a factor-free subgroup of* $\mathcal{F}_2(1)$ *and* $\mu(H_1)$ *is factor-free in* $\mathcal{F}$. *Furthermore,* $\deg \Psi(H_1) = \deg \Psi(\mu_2(H_1))$.

(*d*) *If* K_1, K_2 *are finitely generated factor-free subgroups of* $\mathcal{F}$, *then* $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(K_1, K_2) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mu_2(K_1), \mu_2(K_2))$.

(*e*) *The supremum* $\sup \frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1,H_2)}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)}$ *over all finitely generated factor-free subgroups* H_2 *of* $\mathcal{F}$ *such that* $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2) > 0$ *and* $\deg \Psi(H_2) \le d$, *where* $d \ge 3$ *is an integer, does not exceed* $\sup \frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mu_2(H_1),K_2)}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(K_2)}$ *over all finitely generated factor-free subgroups* K_2 *of* $\mathcal{F}_2(1)$ *with property (Bd) relative to* $\mu_2(H_1)$. *In particular,* $\sigma_d(H_1) \le \sigma_d(\mu_2(H_1))$ *and* $\sigma(H_1) \le \sigma(\mu_2(H_1))$.

Proof. It is clear that the map (5.4) extends to homomorphisms

$$\mu : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}, \quad \mu_2 : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}_2(1).$$

Note that if $a_1 \in G_{\alpha_1}$ and $a_2 \in G_{\alpha_2}$ are nontrivial elements and $\alpha_1 \neq \alpha_2$, then $\mu(a_1)\mu(a_2)$ is a cyclically reduced word. This remark implies that the kernels of the maps μ, μ_2 are trivial, whence μ, μ_2 are monomorphisms.

(a) It follows from the foregoing remark that a word $U \in \mathcal{F}$ with $|U| > 1$ is cyclically reduced if and only if $\mu(U)$ is cyclically reduced.

(b) Let $U_1, U_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ be reduced words and $W\mu(U_1)W^{-1} = \mu(U_2)$ in $\mathcal{F}$. Using induction on $|U_1| + |U_2|$, we will prove that $W \in \mu(\mathcal{F})$. Suppose U_1 is not cyclically reduced and $U_1 \equiv a_1 U_3 a_2$, where $a_1, a_2 \in G_\alpha \setminus \{1\}$ are letters of U_1. Then we can replace U_1 with $U_1' := U_3 a_3$, where $a_3 \in G_\alpha$, $a_3 = a_2 a_1$ in G_α if $a_3 \neq 1$ or with $U_1' := U_3$ if $a_3 = 1$, and we replace W with $W' := W\mu_2(a_1)$. This way we obtain an equality

$$W'\mu(U_1')(W')^{-1} \overset{0}{=} \mu(U_2)$$

in $\mathcal{F}$ in which $|U_1'| + |U_2| < |U_1| + |U_2|$. Hence, it follows from the induction hypothesis that $W \in \mu(\mathcal{F})$, as required. If U_2 is not cyclically reduced, then, analogously to what we did above for U_1, we can decrease the sum $|U_1| + |U_2|$ and use the induction hypothesis.

Thus we may assume that both words U_1, U_2 are cyclically reduced. By part (a), the words $\mu(U_1)$, $\mu(U_2)$ are also cyclically reduced. Observe that if $WV_1W^{-1} = V_2$ in $\mathcal{F}$, where V_1, V_2 are cyclically reduced and W is reduced, then V_2 is a cyclic permutation of V_1. More specifically, there is a factorization $V_1 \equiv V_{11}V_{12}$ and an integer k such that if $k \geq 0$ then $W \equiv V_{12}V_1^k$ and if $k \leq 0$ then $W \equiv V_{11}^{-1}V_1^k$. In either case, $V_2 \equiv V_{12}V_{11}$. Applying this observation to the equality

$$W\mu(U_1)W^{-1} \overset{0}{=} \mu(U_2)$$

in $\mathcal{F}$, we can see from (5.4), when $m \geq 3$, that a cyclic permutation of $\mu(U_1)$ equal to $\mu(U_2)$ must have the form $\mu(\bar{U}_1)$, where $\bar{U}_1$ is a cyclic permutation of U_1. For similar reasons, $W \equiv \mu(V)$ for some $V \in \mathcal{F}$ and part (b) is proven for the subgroup $\mu(\mathcal{F})$. It now follows that $\mu_2(\mathcal{F})$ is also antinormal in $\mathcal{F}_2(1)$.

(c) Arguing on the contrary, suppose H is a factor-free subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$ and one of $\mu(H)$, $\mu_2(H)$ is not factor-free in $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{F}_2(1)$, resp. Then it follows from the definitions that $\mu_2(H)$ is not factor-free in $\mathcal{F}_2(1)$. Hence, there is a reduced word U such that U is not conjugate in $\mathcal{F}$ to a word of length ≤ 1 and

$$\mu(U) \overset{0}{=} WVW^{-1} \tag{5.5}$$

in $\mathcal{F}$, where W is either empty or reduced and V is either a letter of $G_1 \setminus \{1\}$ or V is a reduced word with no letters of G_1. Thus, V is reduced and either $V \in G_1$ or $V \in G(2, m)$.

Assume that the word U in (5.5) is not cyclically reduced. Then $U \equiv a_1 U_1 a_2$, where $a_1, a_2 \in G_\alpha \setminus \{1\}$ are letters of U. If $a_1 a_2 = a_3$ in G_α and $a_3 \in G_\alpha \setminus \{1\}$, then the word $U' \equiv U_1 a_3$, similarly to U, is not conjugate to $\mathcal{F}$ to a word of length ≤ 1 and $\mu(U')$, being conjugate to $\mu(U)$ in $\mathcal{F}$, has a representation of the form (5.5), so U can be replaced with U'. If $a_1 a_2 = 1$ in G_α, then the word U_1 can be taken as U. Hence, by induction on $|U|$, we may assume that U is cyclically reduced.

If the word WVW^{-1} in (5.5) is not reduced, then there are words W', V' such that

$$\mu(U) \overset{0}{=} W'V'(W')^{-1},$$

W', V' have the foregoing properties of W, V, resp., and $2|W'|+|V'| < 2|W|+|V|$. Indeed, if, say $W \equiv W_1 a_1$ and $V \equiv a_2 V_1$, where $a_1, a_2 \in G_\alpha \setminus \{1\}$, then we set $W' := W_1$ and V' is a reduced word equal in $\mathcal{F}$ to $a_1 a_2 V_1 a_1^{-1}$. Note that W', V' have the foregoing properties of W, V, resp., and $|W'| = |W| - 1$, $|V'| \le |V| + 1$, whence $2|W'| + |V'| < 2|W| + |V|$. Thus, by induction on $2|W| + |V|$, we may assume that the word WVW^{-1} in (5.5) is reduced.

Since U is cyclically reduced and $|U| > 1$, it follows from part (a) that $\mu(U)$ is cyclically reduced. Hence, the word W is empty and $\mu(U) \equiv V$, where V is a single letter of $G_1 \setminus \{1\}$ or V has no letters of G_1. However, neither situation is possible by the definition (5.4). This contradiction completes the proof of the first statement of part (c).

Now we will prove the equality $\deg \Psi(H_1) = \deg \Psi(\mu_2(H_1))$ of part (c). It follows from the definition (5.4) that the graph $\Psi(\mu_2(H))$ can be visualized as a graph obtained from $\Psi(H)$ by subdivision of edges of $\Psi(H)$ into paths in accordance with formula (5.4) and subsequent "mergers" of edges that have labels in $G_2 \cup \cdots \cup G_m$. In particular, for every vertex $v \in V\Psi(H)$ with $\deg v > 2$ there will be a unique vertex $u = u(v) \in V_S\Psi(\mu_2(H))$ of degree $\deg u = \deg v$ and this map $v \to u(v)$ is bijective on the sets of all vertices of $\Psi(H)$, $\Psi(\mu_2(H))$ of degree > 2. Hence, the maximal degree of vertices of $\Psi(\mu_2(H))$ is equal to that of $\Psi(H)$, as claimed.

(d) By part (c), the subgroups $\mu_2(K_1), \mu_2(K_2)$ of $\mathcal{F}_2(1)$ are factor-free and the subgroups $\mu(K_1)$, $\mu(K_2)$ of $\mathcal{F}$ are also factor-free. Let $T(\mu_2(K_1), \mu_2(K_2))$ be a set of representatives of those double cosets $\mu_2(K_1)U\mu_2(K_2)$ of $\mathcal{F}_2(1)$, $U \in \mathcal{F}_2(1)$, that have the property $\mu_2(K_1) \cap U\mu_2(K_2)U^{-1} \ne \{1\}$. If $T \in T(\mu_2(K_1), \mu_2(K_2))$, then it follows from the definition of $T(\mu_2(K_1), \mu_2(K_2))$ that there are nontrivial $V_i \in K_i$, $i = 1, 2$, such that $T\mu_2(V_2)T^{-1} = \mu_2(V_1) \ne 1$ in $\mathcal{F}_2(1)$. By part (b), such an equality implies $T \in \mu_2(\mathcal{F})$ (note μ_2 could be replaced with μ). Now we can see that there is a set $S(K_1, K_2) \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ such that $\mu_2(S(K_1, K_2)) = T(\mu_2(K_1), \mu_2(K_2))$ and $S(K_1, K_2)$ is a set of representatives of those double cosets $K_1 S K_2$ of $\mathcal{F}$, $S \in \mathcal{F}$, that have the property $K_1 \cap SK_2S^{-1} \ne \{1\}$. Therefore,

$$\bar{\mathrm{r}}(K_1, K_2) := \sum_{S \in S(K_1, K_2)} \bar{\mathrm{r}}(K_1 \cap SK_2S^{-1}) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mu_2(K_1), \mu_2(K_2)),$$

as desired.

(e) This follows from Lemma 5.2, parts (c)–(d) and definitions. □

6. Proofs of Theorems

For reader's convenience, we restate Theorems 1.1–1.3 before proving them.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F} = G_1 * G_2$ is the free product of two nontrivial groups G_1, G_2 and H_1 is a finitely generated factor-free noncyclic subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$. Then the following claims are true.*

(a) *For every integer $d \ge 3$, there exists a linear programming problem (LP-problem)*

$$\mathcal{P}(H_1, d) = \max\{c(d)x(d) \mid A(d)x(d) \le b(d)\} \tag{1.8}$$

with integer coefficients whose solution is equal to $-\sigma_d(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$.

(b) *There is a finitely generated factor-free subgroup* H_2^* *of* $\mathcal{F}$, $H_2^* = H_2^*(H_1)$, *which corresponds to a vertex solution of the dual problem*

$$\mathcal{P}^*(H_1, d) = \min\{b(d)^\top y(d) \mid A(d)^\top y(d) = c(d)^\top,\ y(d) \geq 0\}$$

of the primal LP-problem (1.8) *of part (a) such that* $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2^*) = \sigma_d(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2^*)$. *In particular, the* WN_d*-coefficient* $\sigma_d(H_1)$ *of* H_1 *is rational. Furthermore, if* $\Psi(H_1)$, $\Psi(H_2^*)$ *denote irreducible core graphs representing subgroups* H_1, H_2^*, *resp., and* $|E\Psi|$ *is the number of oriented edges in a graph* Ψ, *then*

$$|E\Psi(H_2^*)| < 2^{2^{4|E\Psi(H_1)|+1+\log_2\log_2(2d)}}.$$

(c) *There exists a linear semi-infinite programming problem (LSIP-problem)* $\mathcal{P}(H_1) = \sup\{cx \mid Ax \leq b\}$ *with finitely many variables in* x *and with countably many constraints in the system* $Ax \leq b$ *whose dual problem*

$$\mathcal{P}^*(H_1) = \inf\{b^\top y \mid A^\top y = c^\top,\ y \geq 0\}$$

has a solution equal to $-\sigma(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$.

(d) *Let the word problem for both groups* G_1, G_2 *be solvable and let an irreducible core graph* $\Psi(H_1)$ *of* H_1 *be given. Then the LP-problem* (1.8) *of part (a) can be effectively written down and the* WN_d*-coefficient* $\sigma_d(H_1)$ *for* H_1 *can be computed. In addition, an irreducible core graph* $\Psi(H_2^*)$ *of the subgroup* H_2^* *of part (b) can be effectively constructed.*

(e) *Let both* G_1, G_2 *be finite, let* $d := \max(|G_1|, |G_2|) \geq 3$, *and let an irreducible core graph* $\Psi(H_1)$ *of* H_1 *be given. Then the LP-problem* (1.8) *of part (a) coincides with the LSIP-problem* $\mathcal{P}(H_1)$ *of part (c) and the WN-coefficient* $\sigma(H_1)$ *for* H_1 *is rational and computable.*

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Assume that $I = \{1, 2\}$, $\mathcal{F}_2 = G_1 * G_2$ and H_1 is a finitely generated factor-free noncyclic subgroup of $\mathcal{F}_2$. As before, let $\Psi_o(H_1)$ denote a finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph of H_1 and $\Psi(H_1)$ denote the core of $\Psi_o(H_1)$.

Denote $Y_1 := \Psi(H_1)$ and pick an integer $d \geq 3$. As in Sects. 3–4, consider a system of linear inequalities $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ and an LP-problem

$$\max\{-x_s \mid \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]\}. \tag{6.1}$$

According to Theorem A and Lemma 4.2, the maximum of the LP-problem (6.1) is equal to $-\sigma_d(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1)$, where

$$\sigma_d(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1) = \sup \frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1 \times Y_2))}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_2)}$$

over all finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graphs Y_2 with property (Bd) relative to Y_1. By Lemma 5.2, $\sigma_d(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1) = \sigma_d(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$, as desired in part (a).

According to Lemma 4.2, the minimum of the dual problem (4.5) of (6.1) is attained at a vector $\widehat{y}(d)$ which is a vertex of the feasible polyhedron

$$\{y \mid y \geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\} \tag{6.2}$$

of the LP-problem (4.5). By Lemma 4.1, there is a finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph $\widehat{Y}_2$ with property (Bd) such that

$$\mathsf{sol}_d(\mathsf{inq}(\widehat{Y}_2)) = \widehat{y}(d) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\mathrm{r}}(\mathrm{core}(Y_1 \times \widehat{Y}_2)) = \sigma_d(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\widehat{Y}_2). \tag{6.3}$$

Assume that $\widehat{Y}_2$ is not connected and that $\widehat{Y}_3, \widehat{Y}_4$ are (nonempty) subgraphs of $\widehat{Y}_2$ so that there is no path in $\widehat{Y}_2$ from any vertex of $\widehat{Y}_3$ to a vertex of $\widehat{Y}_4$. Clearly, $\widehat{Y}_3, \widehat{Y}_4$ are finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graphs with property (Bd). Invoking Lemma 4.1, denote $\widehat{y}^j := \mathsf{sol}_d(\mathsf{inq}(\widehat{Y}_j))$, $j = 3, 4$. By Lemma 4.1, $\widehat{y}^3, \widehat{y}^4$ are points in the feasible polyhedron (6.2) of (4.5). It is easy to see from the definitions and Lemma 4.1 that $\widehat{y}(d) = \lambda_3\widehat{y}^3 + \lambda_4\widehat{y}^4$ with some positive rational numbers λ_3, λ_4 that satisfy $\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 = 1$. This, however, is impossible when $\widehat{y}(d)$ is a vertex. This contradiction proves that $\widehat{Y}_2$ is a connected graph. Hence, there is a finitely generated factor-free subgroup H_2^* of $\mathcal{F}$ whose irreducible graph $\Psi_{o^*}(H_2^*)$ is $\widehat{Y}_2$, as required.

Now we establish the upper bound

$$|E\widehat{Y}_2| < 2^{2^{4|EY_1|+1+\log_2(\log_2 2d)}} \tag{6.4}$$

on size of $\widehat{Y}_2$, where $\widehat{Y}_2$ is defined by equalities (6.3). Recall that it follows from Lemma 4.2 that

$$-\sigma_d(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1) = \min\{\sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^R \mid y \geq 0, \sum_{j=1}^{i_d} y_j q_j^L = -x_s\} \tag{6.5}$$

$$= \min\{b^\top y \mid A^\top y = c^\top, y \geq 0\} \tag{6.6}$$

$$= \max\{cx \mid Ax \leq b\} = \max\{-x_s \mid \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]\}. \tag{6.7}$$

It is convenient to switch back to the general LP notation as was introduced in Sect. 4 and reminded in (6.5)–(6.7). In particular, let A be an $m \times n$ matrix, i.e., $m = i_d$ and n is the number of variables.

According to Theorem C, we may assume that the minimum of the dual LP-problem (6.5) is attained at a vertex $\widehat{y}(d)$, $\widehat{y}(d) \geq 0$, of the feasible polyhedron $\{y \mid y \geq 0,\ \sum_{j=1}^m y_j q_j^L = -x_s\}$ of the LP-problem (6.5) whose positive components $\widehat{y}_i(d)$ correspond to linearly independent left-hand sides q_i^L of the inequalities q_i, $i = 1, \ldots, m$, of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$. Reordering the inequalities of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ if necessary, we may assume that $\widehat{y}_1(d), \ldots, \widehat{y}_r(d)$ are positive, $q_1^L, \ldots, q_r^L$ are linearly independent and that $\widehat{y}_{r+1}(d) = \ldots = \widehat{y}_m(d) = 0$.

Recall that $Ax \leq b$ is the matrix form of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ and A has size $m \times n$. Let $A_{r,n}$ denote the submatrix of A that consists of the first r rows of A, hence, $\widehat{y}_1(d), \ldots, \widehat{y}_r(d)$ correspond to linearly independent rows of $A_{r,n}$. Let $A_{r\times r}$ denote a submatrix of $A_{r,n}$ of size $r \times r$ with $\det A_{r\times r} \neq 0$ and let $\bar{y}(d) = (\widehat{y}_1(d), \ldots, \widehat{y}_r(d))^\top$ be a truncated version of $\widehat{y}(d)$. Then

$$A_{r\times r}^\top \bar{y}(d) = (c_1, \ldots, c_r)^\top = \bar{c}^\top.$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^m \widehat{y}_i(d) q_i^L = -x_s$, it follows that $c_j = 0$ if c_j corresponds to the column of a variable x_B in $A_{r,n}$ and $c_j = -1$ if c_j corresponds to the column of x_s. Since $\widehat{y}(d) \neq 0$, we conclude that $\bar{c}^\top \neq 0$, hence, one of c_j in $\bar{c}^\top$ is -1 and all other entries of $\bar{c}^\top$ are equal to 0. Since every entry of $A_{r\times r}$ is 0 or $\pm k'$ or $-(k-2)$, where $1 \leq k' \leq d$, $2 \leq k \leq d$, and every row of $A_{r\times r}$ contains at most $d+1$ nonzero entries which are sums of coefficients of variables in an inequality (3.4)–(3.5), it follows that the standard Euclidian norm of any row of $A_{r\times r}$ is at most $(d^2 + (d-2)^2)^{1/2} < d^2$ as $d \geq 3$. Hence, by Hadamard's inequality, we obtain

$$|\det A_{r\times r}| < d^{2r}. \tag{6.8}$$

Invoking the Cramer's rule, we further have that

$$\widehat{y}_i(d) = \frac{\det A^{\top}_{r\times r,i}(\bar{c}^{\top})}{\det A_{r\times r}}, \tag{6.9}$$

where $A^{\top}_{r\times r,i}(\bar{c}^{\top})$ is the matrix obtained from $A_{r\times r}$ by replacing the ith column with $\bar{c}^{\top}$, $i = 1, \dots, r$. Similarly to $A_{r\times r}$, see (6.8), we obtain that

$$|\det A_{r\times r,i}(\bar{c}^{\top})| < d^{2r-2} \tag{6.10}$$

for $\|\bar{c}^{\top}\| = 1$.

In view of (6.8)–(6.10), we can see that a common denominator $L > 0$ of positive rational numbers $\widehat{y}_1(d), \dots, \widehat{y}_r(d)$ satisfies $L < d^{2r}$ and that positive integers $L\widehat{y}_1(d), \dots, L\widehat{y}_r(d)$ are less than d^{2r-2}.

It follows from the definition of the function sol_d, see also Lemma 4.1, that if $\widehat{y}(d) = \mathsf{sol}_d(\widehat{Q})$ then

$$|\widehat{Q}| < rd^{2r-2}, \tag{6.11}$$

where $|Q|$ is the cardinality of a combination with repetitions $Q \sqsubseteq \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ defined so that every element $q \in Q$ is counted as many times as it occurs in Q.

Recall that $\mathsf{inq}(\widehat{Y}_2) = \widehat{Q}$. It follows from the definition of the function inq, see also Lemma 3.3, that $|V_S\widehat{Y}_2| = |\widehat{Q}|$ and, therefore, by (6.11), we get

$$|E\widehat{Y}_2| \le 2d|V_S\widehat{Y}_2| = 2d|\widehat{Q}| < 2drd^{2r-2} < 2rd^{2r}. \tag{6.12}$$

Note that r does not exceed the number n of variables x_B, x_s of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$. Since every index B of x_B is a nonempty subset of V_PY_1, it follows that

$$r \le n \le (2^{|V_PY_1|} - 1) + 1 = 2^{4|EY_1|} \tag{6.13}$$

for $|V_PY_1| = 4|EY_1|$ as every primary vertex of Y_1 has degree 2.

Finally, we obtain from (6.12)–(6.13) that

$$\begin{aligned} |E\widehat{Y}_2| &< 2rd^{2r} = 2^{4|EY_1|+1}d^{2^{4|EY_1|+1}} < 2^{4|EY_1|+1+\log_2 d\cdot 2^{4|EY_1|+1}} \\ &< 2^{(\log_2 d+1)\cdot 2^{4|EY_1|+1}} \le 2^{\log_2(2d)\cdot 2^{4|EY_1|+1}} \\ &\le 2^{2^{4|EY_1|+1+\log_2\log_2(2d)}}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of part (b) of Theorem 1.1.

To prove part (c), we note that it follows from Lemmas 4.2 and 5.2 that the dual problem (4.4) of the LSIP-problem $\sup\{-x_s \mid \mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]\}$, where $Y_1 = \Psi(H_1)$, has the infimum equal to $-\sigma(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1) = -\sigma(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$. This proves part (c).

Now we turn to parts (d)–(e) of Theorem 1.1. First we discuss how to effectively write down inequalities of the system $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$, $d = 3, 4, \dots$. Recall that every inequality of $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]$ is written in the form (3.4)–(3.5) and there are finitely many subsets $A \subseteq S_1(V_PY_1)$ that are indices of k variables $\pm x_A$ in the left-hand sides of inequalities (3.4)–(3.5), where $2 \le k = |T| \le d$. The coefficient of x_s is the integer $-(k-2)$ and the right-hand side of (3.4)–(3.5) is an integer $-N(\Omega_T)_\alpha$, where

$$0 \le N(\Omega_T)_\alpha \le (d-2)|V_PY_1|,$$

see (3.3). This information is sufficient to conclude that the set of inequalities in the system $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ is finite. However, this information is not sufficient to effectively write down inequalities of $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ because the set of available sets T is infinite whenever $G_1 \cup G_2$ is infinite.

To explicitly write down the system $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$, we assume that the word problem for both groups G_1, G_2 is solvable and we will look more closely into construction of inequalities (3.4)–(3.5).

Recall that inequalities (3.4)–(3.5) are defined in Sect. 3 by using an α-admissible function $\Omega_T : T \to S_1(V_P Y_1)$, where $T \in S_2(G_\alpha)$ and $\alpha \in I = \{1, 2\}$.

We also recall that $\sim_{\Omega_T}$ denotes an equivalence relation on the set of all pairs (a, u), where $a \in T$ and $u \in \Omega_T(a)$, see Sect. 3. Making use of the equivalence relation $\sim_{\Omega_T}$, we define a relation $\approx$ on the set T so that $a \approx b$ if and only if there are $u \in \Omega_T(a)$, $v \in \Omega_T(b)$ such that $(a, u) \sim_{\Omega_T} (b, v)$. Note that this relation $\approx$ is reflexive and symmetric. The transitive closure of the relation $\approx$ is an equivalence relation on T which we denote by $\approx_{\Omega_T}$. The equivalence class of $a \in T$ is denoted $[a]_{\approx_{\Omega_T}}$. It follows from the definition of $[a]_{\approx_{\Omega_T}}$ and from the property of being α-admissible for Ω_T that, for every $b_1 \in [a]_{\approx_{\Omega_T}}$, there is an element $b_2 \in [a]_{\approx_{\Omega_T}}$ such that $b_2 \neq b_1$ and there are edges $e_1, e_2 \in EY_1$ such that $(e_1)_+ = (e_2)_+ \in V_S Y_1$, the vertex $(e_1)_+$ has type α, $(e_i)_- \in \Omega_T(b_i)$, $i = 1, 2$, and

$$b_1 b_2^{-1} = \varphi(e_1)\varphi(e_2)^{-1} \tag{6.14}$$

in G_α. Note that if we connect every two such elements $b_1, b_2 \in [a]_{\approx_{\Omega_T}}$ by an edge, then the graph $\Gamma(\Omega_T)$, whose vertex set is T, will have connected components whose vertex sets are equivalence classes $[a]_{\approx_{\Omega_T}}$ of T. This connectedness of subgraphs of $\Gamma(\Omega_T)$ on vertex sets $[a]_{\approx_{\Omega_T}}$ obviously implies the following claim.

Lemma 6.1. *The equations* (6.14) *can be used to determine all elements of the equivalence class* $[a]_{\approx_{\Omega_T}}$ *if only one element in* $[a]_{\approx_{\Omega_T}}$ *is known.*

Proof. This easily follows from definitions. □

Let $C(\alpha, d)$ be a subset of G_α of cardinality $|C(\alpha, d)| = d^2 + d$, $\alpha = 1, 2$, where $d \geq 3$ is a fixed integer. In the arguments below, this set $C(\alpha, d)$ will be held fixed. Note that if $|G_\alpha| < d^2 + d$, so it is not possible to choose $d^2 + d$ distinct elements in G_α, then all inequalities (3.4) if $\alpha = 1$ or (3.5) if $\alpha = 2$ for $k \leq d$, where as before $k = |T|$, can be written down effectively for the following reasons: The sets $S_2(G_\alpha)$ and $\{\Omega_T \mid \Omega_T : T \to S_1(V_P Y_1), T \in S_2(G_\alpha)\}$ are finite, can be written down explicitly, and it is possible to verify whether given function $\Omega_T : T \to S_1(V_P Y_1)$ is α-admissible. Clearly, the same conclusion holds if both G_1, G_2 are finite but in the arguments below we will only need the inequality $|C(\alpha, d)| = d^2 + d$, hence we can just assume that $|G_\alpha| \geq d^2 + d$.

Consider a subset $C \subset C(\alpha, d)$, where $1 \leq |C| \leq k \leq d$ and a set of indeterminates $Z = \{z_1, \ldots, z_{k-|C|}\}$. Note $|C \cup Z| = k$. Consider a function

$$\Omega_{C \cup Z} : C \cup Z \to S_1(V_P Y_1). \tag{6.15}$$

Similarly to the relation $\sim_{\Omega_T}$ defined in Sect. 3, we consider a relation $\sim_{\Omega_{C\cup Z}}$ on the set of all pairs (a, u), where $a \in C \cup Z$ and $u \in \Omega_{C\cup Z}(a)$, defined as follows. Two pairs (a, u) and (b, v) are related by $\sim_{\Omega_{C\cup Z}}$ if and only if either $(a, u) = (b, v)$ or, otherwise, there exist edges $e, f \in EY_1$ such that $e_- = u$, $f_- = v$ and the secondary vertex $e_+ = f_+$ has type α.

We also consider an analogue $\approx_Z$ of the relation $\approx$ defined above so that $a \approx_Z b$, where $a, b \in C \cup Z$, if and only if there are $u \in \Omega_{C\cup Z}(a)$, $v \in \Omega_{C\cup Z}(b)$ such that $(a, u) \sim_{\Omega_{C\cup Z}} (b, v)$. As before, the relation $\approx_Z$ is reflexive and symmetric. By

taking the transitive closure of the relation $\approx_Z$ we obtain an equivalence relation on the set $C \cup Z$ which is denoted by $\approx_{\Omega_{C\cup Z}}$.

We will say that a function $\Omega_{C\cup Z}$, as in (6.15), is *unacceptable* if there is an equivalence class $[(a,u)]_{\sim_{\Omega_{C\cup Z}}}$ of $\sim_{\Omega_{C\cup Z}}$ with a single element in it or there is an equivalence class $[a]_{\approx_{\Omega_{C\cup Z}}}$ of the relation $\approx_{\Omega_{C\cup Z}}$ that contains no elements of C. Note that, when given a function $\Omega_{C\cup Z}$ as in (6.15), we can algorithmically check whether or not $\Omega_{C\cup Z}$ is unacceptable.

If now the function $\Omega_{C\cup Z}$ is not found to be unacceptable, then we attempt to construct a function $\zeta : Z \to G_\alpha$ by using the following algorithm.

First, we set $\zeta_0(c) = c$ if $c \in C$ and let $C_0 := C$, $Z_0 := \varnothing$. Consider the set of all triples (a,u,ℓ), where $a \in C \cup Z$, $u \in \Omega_{C\cup Z}(a)$, $1 \le \ell \le d+1$, and do the following. By induction on $i \ge 0$, assume that the sets $C_i \subseteq G_\alpha$, $Z_i \subseteq Z$ are constructed and a bijective function $\zeta_i : C_0 \cup Z_i \to C_i$ is defined so that the restriction of ζ_i on C_0 is ζ_0. For every unordered pair $\{(a,u,\ell),(b,v,\ell)\}$ of distinct triples with a fixed ℓ (first we use $\ell = 1$, then $\ell = 2$ and so on up to $\ell = d+1$), we check whether there are edges $e, f \in EY_1$ such that $e_- = u$, $f_- = v$, $e_+ = f_+$, and $e_+ = f_+ \in V_S Y_1$ has type α. If there are no such edges, then we pass on to the next pair $\{(a,u,\ell),(b,v,\ell)\}$. If there are such edges e, f, then we consider three Cases 1–3 below, perform the described actions and pass on to the next pair. We remark that these actions can be algorithmically implemented as follows from the solvability of the word problem for G_1, G_2 and the availability of the graph $Y_1 = \Psi(H_1)$.

Case 1. If both $a, b \in C \cup Z_i$, then we check whether the equality

$$\zeta_i(a)\zeta_i(b)^{-1} = \varphi(e)\varphi(f)^{-1}$$

holds in G_α. If this equality is false, then we conclude that the function $\Omega_{C\cup Z}$ is unacceptable and stop. Otherwise, we set

$$Z_{i+1} := Z_i, \quad C_{i+1} := C_i, \quad \zeta_{i+1} := \zeta_i.$$

Case 2. Suppose that exactly one of a, b is in $C \cup Z_i$, say $b \in C \cup Z_i$. Then it is clear that $a \in Z \setminus Z_i$ and we can uniquely determine an element $\eta(a)$ by solving the equation $\eta(a)\zeta_i(b)^{-1} = \varphi(e)\varphi(f)^{-1}$. If $\eta(a) \in C_i$, then we conclude that the function $\Omega_{C\cup Z}$ is unacceptable and stop. Otherwise, we set

$$Z_{i+1} := Z_i \cup \{a\}, \quad C_{i+1} := C_i \cup \{\eta(a)\}$$

and define a function ζ_{i+1} on the set $C \cup Z_{i+1}$ so that $\zeta_{i+1}(a) := \eta(a)$ and the restriction of ζ_{i+1} on $C \cup Z_i$ is ζ_i.

Case 3. If both $a, b \notin C \cup Z_i$, then we set

$$Z_{i+1} := Z_i, \quad C_{i+1} := C_i, \quad \zeta_{i+1} := \zeta_i.$$

Cases 1–3 are complete.

Since every equivalence class $[a]_{\approx_{\Omega_{C\cup Z}}}$ contains an element of C, it follows from the definitions that while this algorithm runs over all pairs for a fixed $\ell' = 1, \dots, d$, one of the following three Cases (C1)–(C3) will occur.

(C1) For some i, $|Z_{i+1}| = |Z_i| + 1$.
(C2) The set $\Omega_{C\cup Z}$ is found to be unacceptable.
(C3) For the index i, corresponding to the last pair $\{(a,u,\ell'),(b,v,\ell')\}$ for parameter ℓ equal to ℓ', one has $Z_i = Z$.

Since $|Z| \leq d-1$, we can see that it is not possible for Case (C1) to occur for all $\ell' = 1, \ldots, d$. Hence, running this algorithm consecutively for $\ell' = 1, \ldots, d$, results either in conclusion that the function $\Omega_{C\cup Z}$ is unacceptable or in construction of a bijective function

$$\zeta = \zeta_i : C \cup Z \to C_i \subseteq G_\alpha,$$

where $Z_i = Z$, in which case we say that the function $\Omega_{C\cup Z}$ is *acceptable*. Furthermore, setting $T := \zeta(C \cup Z)$ and $\Omega_T(\zeta(a)) := \Omega_{C\cup Z}(a)$ for every $a \in C \cup Z$, we obtain an α-admissible function Ω_T on the set $T \subseteq G_\alpha$.

Observe that the set of all such functions $\Omega_{C\cup Z} : C \cup Z \to S_1(V_P Y_1)$, where $C \subseteq C(\alpha, d)$ and $Z = \{z_1, \ldots, z_{k-|C|}\}$, see (6.15), is finite (recall the set $C(\alpha, d)$ is fixed) and that all such functions can be written down explicitly. Moreover, using the foregoing algorithm, we can verify whether a function $\Omega_{C\cup Z}$ is acceptable and, when doing so, construct a unique function $\zeta : C \cup Z \to S_1(V_P Y_1)$, where $T := \zeta(C \cup Z)$, so that $\Omega_T(\zeta(a)) := \Omega_{C\cup Z}(a)$ for every $a \in C \cup Z$ and $\zeta(c) = c$ if $c \in C$. Therefore, in order to establish that inequalities (3.4)–(3.5) can be effectively written down, it remains to prove the following.

Lemma 6.2. *For every α-admissible function $\Omega_{T'} : T' \to S_1(V_P Y_1)$, where $T' \subset G_\alpha$ and $2 \leq |T'| = k \leq d$, there exists an acceptable function*

$$\Omega_{C\cup Z} : C \cup Z \to S_1(V_P Y_1),$$

where $C \subset C(\alpha, d)$ and $Z = \{z_1, \ldots, z_{k-|C|}\}$, such that if $T := \zeta(C \cup Z)$ and if $\Omega_T : T \to S_1(V_P Y_1)$ is the α-admissible function, defined by $\Omega_T(\zeta(a)) := \Omega_{C\cup Z}(a)$ for every $a \in C \cup Z$ and $\zeta(c) = c$ for $c \in C$, then the two inequalities (3.4)*, that correspond to $\Omega_{T'}$ and to Ω_T if $\alpha = 1$, or the two inequalities* (3.5)*, that correspond to $\Omega_{T'}$ and to Ω_T if $\alpha = 2$, are identical.*

To prove Lemma 6.2, we first establish an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose $\Omega_{T'} : T' \to S_1(V_P Y_1)$ is an α-admissible function, where $2 \leq |T'| \leq d$, and $T' = E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_r$ is a partition of T' into equivalence classes $[a]_{\approx_{\Omega_{T'}}}$ of the equivalence relation $\approx_{\Omega_{T'}}$. Then there are elements $h_1, \ldots, h_r \in G_\alpha$ such that the set $T := E_1 h_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_r h_r$ has cardinality $|T| = |T'|$ and every set $E_i h_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$, contains an element from the set $C(\alpha, d)$.*

Proof. By induction on i, where $1 \leq i \leq r$, we will prove the existence of elements $h_1, \ldots, h_i \in G_\alpha$ with the property that the set $E_1 h_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_i h_i$ has cardinality $\sum_{j=1}^{i} |E_j h_j|$ and every set $E_j h_j$, $j = 1, \ldots, i$, contains an element from $C(\alpha, d)$.

If $i = 1$, then we set $h_1 := b^{-1}c$, where $b \in E_1$ and $c \in C(\alpha, d)$.

Making the induction hypothesis, assume that there are elements $h_1, \ldots, h_i \in G_\alpha$ with the desired properties.

To make the induction step from i to $i+1$, denote

$$C_i(\alpha, d) := C(\alpha, d) \cap (E_1 h_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_i h_i)$$

and let $b \in E_{i+1}$. For an element $c \in C(\alpha, d) \setminus C_i(\alpha, d)$, we consider the set $R_c := E_{i+1} b^{-1} c$. Clearly, R_c contains an element from $C(\alpha, d)$ and if R_c is disjoint from $E_1 h_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_i h_i$, then we can set $h_{i+1} := b^{-1}c$. Therefore, we may assume that R_c contains an element from $E_1 h_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_i h_i$ for every $c \in C(\alpha, d) \setminus C_i(\alpha, d)$.

Suppose that elements in $E_1 h_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_i h_i$ are indexed by integers from 1 to $|E_1 h_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_i h_i|$ and elements in $R_c = E_{i+1} b^{-1} c$, where b and c are chosen as above, are indexed by integers from 1 to $|E_{i+1}|$ so that, for every $e \in E_{i+1}$, the

index of $eb^{-1}c \in R_c$ is equal to that of $e \in E_{i+1}$. Thus, we wish to keep indices stable when multiplying E_{i+1} by $b^{-1}c$.

Making use of these indices, we fix an element $b \in E_{i+1}$ and, for every $c \in C(\alpha, d) \setminus C_i(\alpha, d)$, we consider the pair $(j_R(c), j_E(c))$ of indices $j_R(c), j_E(c)$ in $R_c = E_{i+1}b^{-1}c$ and in $E_1h_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_ih_i$, resp., of an element of the intersection $R_c \cap (E_1h_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_ih_i)$ which is not empty as was assumed above.

Suppose that $(j_R(c_1), j_E(c_1)) = (j_R(c_2), j_E(c_2))$. Then it follows from the definitions that if $e_1, e_2 \in E_{i+1}$ are such that

$$e_1b^{-1}c_1 \in R_{c_1} \cap (E_1h_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_ih_i) \quad \text{and} \quad e_2b^{-1}c_2 \in R_{c_2} \cap (E_1h_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_ih_i),$$

then $e_1 = e_2$ and $e_1b^{-1}c_1 = e_2b^{-1}c_2$ in G_α. These equalities imply that $c_1 = c_2$. Therefore, for distinct elements $c_1, c_2 \in C(\alpha, d) \setminus C_i(\alpha, d)$, the pairs $(j_R(c_1), j_E(c_1))$, $(j_R(c_2), j_E(c_2))$ are also distinct. However, the number of elements c in $C(\alpha, d) \setminus C_i(\alpha, d)$ is

$$|C(\alpha, d)| - |C_i(\alpha, d)| \geq (d^2 + d) - d = d^2$$

and the number of all such pairs $(j_R(c), j_E(c))$ is less than d^2. This contradiction completes the induction step and Lemma 6.3 is proved. □

Proof of Lemma 6.2. Utilizing the notation of Lemma 6.3, we let $T' = E_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_r$ and let $h_1, \ldots, h_r \in G_\alpha$ be elements such that the set $T := E_1h_1 \cup \cdots \cup E_rh_r$ has cardinality $|T| = |T'| = k$ and every set E_ih_i, $i = 1, \ldots, r$, contains an element from $C(\alpha, d)$. Define a function $\widehat{\Omega} : T \to S_1(V_PY_1)$ so that if $a \in E_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, r$, then $\widehat{\Omega}(ah_i) := \Omega_{T'}(a)$. Define $C := C(\alpha, d) \cap T$ and let $C = \{c_1, \ldots, c_{|C|}\}$. Introducing more notation, denote $T = \{c_1, \ldots, c_{|C|}, b_1, \ldots, b_{k-|C|}\}$ and $Z = \{z_1, \ldots, z_{k-|C|}\}$. Define a function $\Omega_{C \cup Z} \to S_1(V_PY_1)$ by setting $\Omega_{C\cup Z}(c_i) := \widehat{\Omega}(c_i)$ and $\Omega_{C\cup Z}(z_j) := \widehat{\Omega}(b_j)$ for all i, j. In view of Lemma 6.1, it is not difficult to see that the function $\Omega_{C\cup Z}$ is acceptable, $\zeta(C \cup Z) = T$, and if $\Omega_T : T \to S_1(V_PY_1)$ is the function defined by $\Omega_T(\zeta(a)) := \Omega_{C\cup Z}(a)$ for every $a \in C \cup Z$, where $\zeta(c) = c$ for $c \in C$, then the following hold: Ω_T is an α-admissible function, $\Omega_T = \widehat{\Omega}$, and the inequalities (3.4) if $\alpha = 1$ or the inequalities (3.5) if $\alpha = 2$, corresponding to $\Omega_{T'}$ and to Ω_T, are identical. Lemma 6.2 is proved. □

To finish the proof of part (d) of Theorem 1.1, we remark that, by Lemma 6.2, the LP-problem $\max\{-x_s \mid \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]\}$ can be effectively written down. Solving this LP-problem we obtain, by Lemma 4.2, the number $-\sigma_d(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1)$ which is equal to $-\sigma_d(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$ by Lemma 5.2. Since the number $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$ is computable off the graph Y_1, the coefficient $\sigma_d(Y_1)$ is also computable.

Since the LP-problem $\max\{-x_s \mid \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]\}$ can be effectively written down, its dual problem (6.5) can also be effectively constructed. Using the notation of the foregoing proof of parts (a)–(c), we observe that a vertex solution $\widehat{y}(d)$ to (6.5) can be computed, see [25]. Hence, a combination with repetitions $\widehat{Q}$ such that $\mathsf{sol}_d(\widehat{Q}) = \widehat{y}(d)$ is also computable. Therefore, a graph $\widehat{Y}_2 = \Psi(H_2^*)$ such that $\mathsf{inq}(\widehat{Y}_2) = \widehat{Q}$ can be effectively constructed and the proof of part (d) is complete.

To show part (e), we note that if both groups G_1, G_2 are finite, then any irreducible finite $\mathcal{A}$-graph Ψ has the property that $\deg u \leq \max\{|G_1|, |G_2|\}$ for every secondary vertex $u \in V_S\Psi$. Hence, letting $d := \max\{|G_1|, |G_2|\}$, we obtain $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1] = \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ and so, by Lemma 4.2, $\sigma(Y_1) = \sigma_d(Y_1)$. Since the coefficient

$\sigma_d(Y_1)$ is rational and computable by part (d), the number $\sigma(H_1) = \sigma(Y_1)$ is also rational and computable. Theorem 1.1 is proved. $\square$

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F} = G_1 * G_2$ is the free product of two nontrivial finite groups G_1, G_2 and H_1 is a subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$ given by a finite generating set $\mathcal{S}$ of words over the alphabet $\mathcal{A} = G_1 \cup G_2$. Then the following are true.*

(a) *In deterministic polynomial time of size of $\mathcal{S}$, one can determine whether H_1 is factor-free and noncyclic and, if so, one can construct an irreducible graph $\Psi_o(H_1)$ of H_1.*

(b) *If H_1 is factor-free and noncylcic, then, in deterministic exponential time of size of $\mathcal{S}$, one can write down and solve an LP-problem $\mathcal{P} = \max\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ whose solution is equal to $-\sigma(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$. In particular, the WN-coefficient $\sigma(H_1)$ of H_1 is computable in deterministic exponential time of size of $\mathcal{S}$.*

(c) *If H_1 is factor-free and noncylcic, then, in deterministic double exponential time of size of $\mathcal{S}$, one can construct an irreducible core graph $\Psi(H_2^*)$ of H_2^*, where H_2^* is a finitely generated factor-free subgroup $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1, H_2^*) = \sigma(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2^*)$. In addition, if $|E\Psi|$ denotes the number of oriented edges of a graph Ψ, $\Psi(H_1)$ is an irreducible core graph of H_1, and $d := \max(|G_1|, |G_2|)$, then $|E\Psi(H_2^*)| < 2^{2^{4|E\Psi(H_1)|+1+\log_2 \log_2(2d)}}$.*

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Part (a) follows from Lemma 2.1.

To show part (b), we observe that, in the case when G_1, G_2 are finite, we can effectively write down the system $\mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$, where $d = \max\{|G_1|, |G_2|\}$, and this can be done in exponential time of size of Y_1. Furthermore, by Lemma 2.1, the size of the graph Y_1 is polynomial in size $\sum_{S \in \mathcal{S}} |S|$ of the generating set $\mathcal{S}$. It follows from Theorem 1.1(e) that $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1] = \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$. The size of the system $\mathsf{SLI}[Y_1] = \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]$ is exponential in size of Y_1. Hence, the size of the primal LP-problem $\max\{-x_s \mid \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]\}$ as well as the size of the dual problem (4.5) are exponential in size of Y_1. By Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 5.2, an optimal solution to the dual problem (4.5) is equal to

$$-\sigma_d(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1) = -\sigma_d(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1) = -\sigma(Y_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1) = -\sigma(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1).$$

It remains to mention that an LP-problem $\max\{cx \mid Ax \le b\}$ can be solved in polynomial time of size of the problem, see [25], and that the reduced rank $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(Y_1) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$ can be computed in polynomial time of size of Y_1.

To prove part (c), we note that the size of the dual LP-problem (4.5), similarly to size of $\max\{-x_s \mid \mathsf{SLI}_d[Y_1]\}$, is at most exponential in size of Y_1 and that a vertex solution $\widehat{y}(d)$ to (4.5) can be computed in polynomial time of size of the dual LP-problem (4.5), see [25]. Note that here and below we use the notation of the proof of part (b) of Theorem 1.1. Hence, both a vertex solution $\widehat{y}(d)$ and a combination with repetitions $\widehat{Q}$ such that $\mathsf{sol}_d(\widehat{Q}) = \widehat{y}(d)$ can be computed in deterministic exponential time of size of Y_1. In view of inequalities (6.11) and (6.13), we obtain that

$$|\widehat{Q}| < rd^{2r-2} < 2^{4|EY_1|} d^{2^{4|EY_1|+1}} = 2^{2^{O(|EY_1|)}}.$$

Therefore, a desired graph $\widehat{Y}_2 = \Psi(H_2^*)$ such that $\mathsf{inq}(\widehat{Y}_2) = \widehat{Q}$ can be constructed from $\widehat{Q}$ (this construction is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.2) in deterministic double exponential time of size of $Y_1 = \Psi(H_1)$.

The inequality

$$|E\Psi(H_2^*)| < 2^{2^{4|E\Psi(H_1)|+1+\log_2\log_2(2d)}},$$

where, as above, $d = \max(|G_1|, |G_2|)$, follows from part (d) of Theorem 1.1. Theorem 1.2 is proved. □

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F} = \prod_{\alpha\in I}^* G_\alpha$ is the free product of nontrivial groups G_α, $\alpha \in I$, and H_1 is a finitely generated factor-free noncyclic subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$. Then there are two disjoint finite subsets I_1, I_2 of I such that if $\widehat{G}_1 := \prod_{\alpha\in I_1}^* G_\alpha$, $\widehat{G}_2 := \prod_{\alpha\in I_2}^* G_\alpha$, and $\widehat{\mathcal{F}} := \widehat{G}_1 * \widehat{G}_2$, then there exists a finitely generated factor-free subgroup $\widehat{H}_1$ of $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}$ with the following properties.*

(a) $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\widehat{H}_1) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$, $\sigma_d(\widehat{H}_1) \geq \sigma_d(H_1)$ *for every* $d \geq 3$, *and* $\sigma(\widehat{H}_1) \geq \sigma(H_1)$. *In particular, if the conjecture* (1.5) *fails for H_1 then the conjecture* (1.5) *also fails for $\widehat{H}_1$.*

(b) *If the word problem for all groups G_α, $\alpha \in I_1 \cup I_2$, is solvable and a finite irreducible graph of H_1 is given, then the LP-problem $\mathcal{P}(\widehat{H}_1, d)$ for $\widehat{H}_1$ of part (a) of Theorems 1.1 can be effectively written down and the WN_d-coefficient $\sigma_d(\widehat{H}_1)$ for $\widehat{H}_1$ can be computed.*

(c) *Let groups G_α, where $\alpha \in I_1 \cup I_2$, be finite, let H_1 be effectively given either by a finite irreducible graph or by a finite generating set, and let*

$$d' := \max\{|I_1 \cup I_2|, \max\{|G_\alpha| : \alpha \in I_1 \cup I_2\}\}.$$

Then $\sigma_{d'}(\widehat{H}_1) \geq \sigma(H_1)$ and there is an algorithm that decides whether the conjecture (1.5) *holds for H_1.*

Proof of Theorem 1.3. (a) We assume that the subgroup H_1 is given by an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph $\Psi(H_1)$ with $\mathrm{core}(\Psi(H_1)) = \Psi(H_1)$. Note that it is also possible to assume that H_1 is defined by a finite generating elements $\mathcal{S}$ whose elements are words over $\mathcal{A}$. In the latter case, we would apply Lemma 2.1 which, when given a finite generating set of a subgroup H of $\mathcal{F}$, verifies that H is a factor-free subgroup of $\mathcal{F}$ and, if so, constructs an irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph of H.

Making use of the graph $Y_1 := \Psi(H_1)$ of H_1, we switch from the original index set I to its finite subset $I(H_1)$ and rename it by $\{1, \ldots, m\}$. Here and below we use the notation introduced in Sect. 5. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $m \geq 3$, otherwise we may set $\widehat{H}_1 := H_1$. Consider an embedding $\mu_2 : \mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F}_2(1)$ defined by means of the map (5.4), where $\mathcal{F}_2(1) = G_1 * G(2, m)$ and $G(2, m) = G_2 * \cdots * G_m$. Denote $\widehat{H}_1 := \mu_2(H_1)$. Then $\bar{\mathrm{r}}(\widehat{H}_1) = \bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)$ and, by Lemma 5.3(e), $\sigma_d(H_1) \leq \sigma_d(\widehat{H}_1)$ for every $d \geq 3$. Consequently, $\sigma(H_1) \leq \sigma(\widehat{H}_1)$ as well. This proves part (a).

(b) Assume that the word problem is solvable in groups G_α, $\alpha \in I(H_1)$. Then the word problem is also solvable in factors $G_1, G(2, m)$ of the free product $\mathcal{F}_2(1) = G_1 * G(2, m)$. Furthermore, using the graph Y_1 of H_1 and the map (5.4), we can effectively construct a finite irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph $\Psi(\widehat{H}_1)$ with $\mathrm{core}(\Psi(\widehat{H}_1)) = \Psi(\widehat{H}_1)$. By Theorem 1.1(d), the LP-problem $\mathcal{P}(\widehat{H}_1, d) = \mathcal{P}(\Psi(\widehat{H}_1), d)$, associated with $\widehat{H}_1$, can be effectively constructed and the coefficient $\sigma_d(\widehat{H}_1)$ can be computed, as claimed in part (b).

(c) We will continue to use the notation introduced above. Suppose that all factors G_α, where $\alpha \in I(H_1) = \{1, \ldots, m\}$, are finite and H_1 is effectively given by

its irreducible $\mathcal{A}$-graph $Y_1 := \Psi(H_1)$ with $\mathrm{core}(Y_1) = Y_1$ (or by a finite generating set; Lemma 2.1 reduces the latter case to the former one). By Lemma 5.2, when computing the number $\sigma(H_1) = \sup \frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1,H_2)}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)}$, we may assume that the subgroup H_2 has property (B) and satisfies the condition $I(H_2) \subseteq I(H_1)$. The latter condition implies that the degree of any primary vertex of $Y_2 := \Psi(H_2)$ does not exceed $|I(H_1)|$. On the other hand, the degree of every secondary vertex of Y_2 does not exceed $\max\{|G_\alpha| : \alpha \in I(H_1)\}$. Hence, the degree $\deg v$ of every vertex v of Y_2 satisfies

$$\deg v \le d' := \max\{|I(H_1)|, \max\{|G_\alpha| : \alpha \in I(H_1)\}\}. \tag{6.16}$$

Thus, by Lemma 5.2, we may conclude that

$$\sigma(H_1) = \sigma_{d'}(H_1) = \sup \tfrac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1,H_2)}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)},$$

where the supremum is taken over all subgroups H_2 with property (Bd), where $d = d'$. Applying Lemma 5.3(e) to H_1, we obtain $\sigma(H_1) = \sigma_{d'}(H_1) \le \sigma_{d'}(\widehat{H}_1)$. Recall that an irreducible graph $\Psi(\widehat{H}_1)$ of $\widehat{H}_1 = \mu_2(H_1)$ can be effectively constructed from Y_1 (for details see the proof of Lemma 5.3(c)) and the word problem is solvable for factors of the free product $\mathcal{F}_2(1) = G_1 * G(2,m)$. Invoking Theorem 1.1(d), we see that the LP-problem $\mathcal{P}(\widehat{H}_1, d') = \mathcal{P}(\Psi(\widehat{H}_1), d')$ can be written down and hence the coefficient $\sigma_{d'}(\widehat{H}_1)$ can be computed, as desired. The proof of Theorem 1.3 is complete. □

In conclusion, we mention that it is not clear whether there is a duality gap between the LSIP-problem $\sup\{-x_s \mid \mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]\}$, introduced in Sect. 4, and its dual problem (4.4) and it would be of interest to find this out. Another natural problem is to find an algorithm that solves the dual problem (4.4) of the LSIP-problem $\sup\{-x_s \mid \mathsf{SLI}[Y_1]\}$ and thereby effectively computes the WN-coefficient $\sigma(\Psi(H_1)) = \sigma(H_1)$ for a finitely generated factor-free subgroup H_1 of the free product of two groups (and, perhaps, more than two groups) which are not necessarily finite. It would also be interesting to find an algorithm that computes the Hanna Neumann coefficient $\bar{\sigma}(H_1)$ for a finitely generated factor-free noncyclic subgroup H_1 of the free product $\mathcal{F}$ of two finite groups which is defined as $\bar{\sigma}(H_1) := \sup \frac{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1 \cap H_2)}{\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_1)\bar{\mathrm{r}}(H_2)}$ over all finitely generated factor-free noncyclic subgroups H_2 of $\mathcal{F}$.

Acknowledgments. The author is grateful to the referee for helpful remarks and suggestions.

References

[1] Y. Antolín, A. Martino, and I. Schwabrow, *Kurosh rank of intersections of subgroups of free products of right-orderable groups*, preprint, `http://arxiv.org/abs/1109.0233v3`

[2] A. Charnes, W. W. Cooper, K. O. Kortanek, *Duality, Haar programs and finite sequence spaces*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **48**(1962) 783–786.

[3] A. Charnes, W. W. Cooper and K. Kortanek, *On representations of semi-infinite program which have no duality gaps*, Management Sci. **12**(1965), 113–121.

[4] W. Dicks, *Equivalence of the strengthened Hanna Neumann conjecture and the amalgamated graph conjecture*, Invent. Math. **117**(1994), 373–389.

[5] W. Dicks, *Simplified Mineyev*, preprint, `http://mat.uab.cat/~dicks/SimplifiedMineyev.pdf`

[6] W. Dicks and S. V. Ivanov, *On the intersection of free subgroups in free products of groups*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **144**(2008), 511–534.

[7] W. Dicks and S. V. Ivanov, *On the intersection of free subgroups in free products of groups with no 2-torsion*, Illinois J. Math. **54**(2010), 223–248.

[8] J. Friedman, *Sheaves on graphs, their homological invariants, and a proof of the Hanna Neumann conjecture: with an appendix by Warren Dicks*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **233**(2014), no. 1100. xii+106 pp.
[9] M. A. Goberna and M. A. López, *Linear semi-infinite programming theory: an updated survey*, European J. Oper. Res. **143**(2002), 390–405.
[10] W. Haken, *Theorie der Normalflächen*, Acta Math. **105**(1961), 245–375.
[11] J. Hass, J. C. Lagarias and N. Pippenger, *The computational complexity of knot and link problems*, J. Assoc. Comput. Mach. **46**(1999), 185–211.
[12] G. Hemion, *The classification of knots and 3-dimensional spaces*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1993.
[13] S. V. Ivanov, *On the intersection of finitely generated subgroups in free products of groups*, Internat. J. Algebra and Comp. **9**(1999), 521–528.
[14] S. V. Ivanov, *Intersecting free subgroups in free products of groups*, Internat. J. Algebra and Comp. **11**(2001), 281–290.
[15] S. V. Ivanov, *On the Kurosh rank of the intersection of subgroups in free products of groups*, Adv. Math. **218**(2008), 465–484.
[16] S. V. Ivanov, *The computational complexity of basic decision problems in 3-dimensional topology*, Geom. Dedicata **131**(2008), 1–26.
[17] S. V. Ivanov, *A property of groups and the Cauchy-Davenport theorem*, J. Group Theory **13**(2010), 21–39.
[18] S. V. Ivanov, *Intersecting free subgroups in free products of left ordered groups*, submitted.
[19] W. H. Jaco and J. L. Tollefson, *Algorithms for the complete decomposition of a closed 3-manifold*, Illinois J. Math. **39**(1995), 358–406.
[20] A. G. Kurosh, *The theory of groups*, Chelsea, 1956.
[21] R. C. Lyndon and P. E. Schupp, *Combinatorial group theory*, Springer-Verlag, 1977.
[22] I. Mineyev, *Submultiplicativity and the Hanna Neumann conjecture*, Ann. Math. **175**(2012), 393–414.
[23] H. Neumann, *On the intersection of finitely generated free groups*, Publ. Math. **4**(1956), 186–189; Addendum, Publ. Math. **5**(1957), 128.
[24] W. D. Neumann, *On the intersection of finitely generated subgroups of free groups*, Lecture Notes in Math. (Groups-Canberra 1989) **1456**(1990), 161–170.
[25] A. Schrijver, *Theory of linear and integer programming*, John Wiley & Sons, 1986.
[26] J. R. Stallings, *Topology of finite graphs*, Invent. Math. **71**(1983), 551–565.
[27] G. Tardos, *On the intersection of subgroups of a free group*, Invent. Math. **108**(1992), 29–36.

Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801, U.S.A.
E-mail address: ivanov@illinois.edu